DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 080 217 PS 006 816

TITLE	Perspectives on Parent Participation in Project Head Start: An Analysis and Critique.
INSTITUTION	MIDCO Educational Associates, Inc., Denver, Colo.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Child Development (DHEW), Washington, D. C. Bureau of Head Start and Child Service Programs.
REPORT NO	HEW-OS-72-45
PUB DATE	Oct 72
NOTE	226p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$9.87
DESCRIPTORS	*Economic Disadvantagement; *Educational History; Educational Theories; Group Discussion; Home Visits; *Literature Reviews; *Parent Participation; Policy; *Preschool Programs; Social Change
IDENTIFIERS	*Project Head Start

ABSTRACT

This report is one of four describing a project which investigated the impact of Head Start parent participation on the program's quality, on institutional changes in the community, on the Head Start children, and on the Head Start parents themselves. Two types of parent participation were investigated: (1) parents in decision-making roles, and (2) parents in learner roles. Another type of involvement in which parents were paid employees in Head Start programs was also studied. This report is divided into two parts. Part I is a discussion of the theoretical orientations behind the formation of Head Start and the other anti-poverty programs, and an examination of the history and development of the Community Action Program and Head Start itself. Part I concludes with a description and analysis of parent participation in the program. Part II is a review of the literature of the past decade related to Head Start and Head Start type programs. The report also gives a summary and analysis of the parent participation project research implications. Related documents include PS 006 814, PS 006 815, and PS 006 817. (ST)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 080217

PS 006816

PERSPECTIVES ON PARENT PARTICIPATION IN PROJECT HEAD START

An Analysis and Critique

Prepared for: Project Head Start
Office of Child Development
Department of Health, Education
and Welfare

Contractor: MIDCO Educational Associates, Inc.
Westland Bank Building
10403 West Colfax Avenue
Suite 660
Denver, Colorado 80215

Contract Number: HEW-OS-72-45

October, 1972

MIDCO EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATES INC.

PREFACE

In 1965, when Project Head Start* was inaugurated, there were very few precedents for this type of program. Although nursery schools had existed for some time, they were, as they still are today, largely a middle class phenomenon. In addition, as Hess et al (1971, page 267) have noted, much of the research that pre-dated Head Start had "used white, urban middle class samples exclusively."

To be sure, a knowledge base to "justify" a program for preschool children was emerging. Martin Deutsch was having considerable success in New York City in his work with deprived children; there was the work of Bloom (1964) that "discussed the importance of early experience upon subsequent cognitive growth and education achievement" (Hess et al, op.cit., page 265); of Kagan and Moss (1962) on "general psycho-social development" (op.cit.); and "a body of research and writings on the specific influence of home and maternal factors in the socialization of cognitive behavior in young children," (op.cit.).

Parent participation in Head Start was to a large extent related to these developments. As Hess (op.cit.) points out:

> "A compelling line of argument was developed for parent participation in early education programs. It contended that early experience affects subsequent intellectual and educational growth and achievement, and that children who grow up in homes disadvantaged by racial discrimination and poverty have a deficit of experiences presumably essential for

* Though usually referred to simply as Head Start, the official name of the effort is Project Head Start. In this report, we use both terms. Additionally, local Head Start programs are sometimes referred to as Head Starts.

academic achievement in the public schools."

As we shall have occasion to note, the assumptions stated by Hess, though not necessarily reflective of his own position, became the underpinning for Project Head Start. The arguments for involving parents in the program were largely rehabilitative in nature. Their intent was to assist parents "in providing a more adequate educational environment for their young children." (op.cit., pages 265-266)

At the same time, however, there was another set of arguments that emanated from a different direction. Although Head Start was conceived primarily as a program for young children, the context in which it developed was that of the Community Action Program (CAP) of the Office of Economic Opportunity(OEO). In the words of the enabling legislation, a community action program was one "which is developed, conducted, and administered with the maximum feasible participation of the residents of the areas and members of the groups served..." (Sec. 202(a)(3) of S.2642 and the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964). Thus a second rationale for parent participation was a mandate in the legislation itself.*

In Hess's view, the latter thrust was primarily social and political in origin -- as opposed to educational -- although one could argue as does Gordon**that most rationales for overcoming the effects of deprivation are social in origin. According to Hess and his associates it was the impetus of the civil rights movement

* The complexities of and confusion about this mandate are discussed in Chapters 2 and 3 of Part One of this report.

**See Chapter 1, Part Two, of this report.

which preceded, but only barely, the enactment of the EOA that lead to the development.

> "One feature of the civil rights movement was a bitter and articulate criticism of the public schools, especially in urban areas. Criticisms concentrated upon the lack of relationship between the educational experiences offered by the school and the local community's cultural experiences and needs." (Hess et.al, op. cit., page 266)

There is no doubt that social and political considerations were among the factors that influenced the design of the program, as indeed they influenced the Economic Opportunity Act itself. At the same time, however, there was also a body of experience, knowledge, and a set of assumptions about the causes of deprivation that provided a rationale for this approach as well. Primarily, this set of assumptions was derived from studies by sociologists, anthropologists, political scientists and to some extent economists, who viewed deprivation not so much the result of faulty or inadequate socialization, but the consequence of the way our society was organized, and the fact that our major institutions, among which education was a prime example, were geared mainly to serving the middle class. In this view, the aim of anti-poverty programs was not merely to provide additional services to the poor, but to make sure that the programs and services remained relevant to their aspirations and needs.

From this perspective, the purpose of parent participation went far beyond the training or education of parents so they could "provide a more adequate educational environment for their young children" within the family. Here the emphasis was to give

parents, or other residents of poverty areas, a measure of control over the services and programs that were intended for their benefit.

According to Hess and his associates,

> "It was not widely recognized at the time that the rationale and points of view that underlay these two influences -- educational and political -- soon would come into conflict. There may be an inherent contradiction between the arguments that have to do with cumulative deficit and those which support ethnic pride and self-determination for ghetto communities." (Hess et al, op. cit., page 266)

A somewhat similar concern is noted in the Request for Proposal that initiated this study:

> "While the value of parent participation in the child's development has long been recognized as a central element in optimum growth, the value of parent participation in decision-making efforts about staffing, budget, curriculum, personnel and other matters relating to program operation has been questioned. We need to examine the Head Start experience for whatever guidance it can offer as to whether the optimism about the value of the role of learner, and the skepticism about the values of the role of decision-maker as these have been realized in current educational practice are justified." (page 3 of 11 of the Work Statement)

Whether there is an "inherent contradiction" or conflict between these two roles is open to question. As the Technical Report on the field research which formed part of this study shows, parent participation of either type -- learner or decision-maker -- has positive effects on the program. In addition, when both types are combined in one program, there is further movement in a positive direction. And from a theoretical position, there is

justification for parents in decision-making roles even if it causes conflict. As Polly Greenberg who participated in the development of Head Start at OEO, and later played an important role in the program of the Child Development Group of Mississippi notes:

> "Integrating a few classrooms in a token, or better yet in a real way is unquestionably a step ahead for Negroes in a Jim Crow community. But it is not nearly as meaningful as integrating the community itself. Since a child doesn't live and learn exclusively in a classroom, I was worried about OEO's nervousness in urging changes of attitudes and behavior of the child's entire community. We couldn't claim to be concerned with child development and yet ignore the terrible indignities and dangers this child would suffer in his devoutly segregated community. We couldn't be devoted child development workers especially in such a state as Mississippi and not be bothered with significant action in human and community development, too." (Greenberg, 1969, page 10)

Hess, in a paper that preceded the one we have been quoting came to somewhat similar conclusions:

> "... it seems unlikely that all models of deprivation must ultimately include the effects of social structure upon individual cognitive behavior and the need to modify that structure if intervention techniques are to succeed." (Hess, 1969, page 37)

In certain respects, this report is an exploration of the issues we have just posed. From the very beginning of OEO, and of Head Start as well, there was considerable controversy about the nature of poverty -- its causes and its cure -- and about the role that residents of poverty areas should play in the pro-

grams. While there was virtually no argument about residents (or parents) as employees, volunteers or recipients of service, there was much debate and confusion about their decision-making role.

In Moynihan's view (1969) it was this latter aspect which led to virtual demise of the Community Action Program, for by giving residents a voice in the program, it released years of anger and frustration which inevitably led to assaults on the "establishment," and thereby antagonized the mayors, the Congress, and even the President. As we will show, however, this occurred in relatively few communities, although, as it happened, they were the communities that received most attention from the press and consequently created a climate of opinion that effected the way the program as a whole came to be viewed.

For the most part, OEO programs were based on what we define as "a deficit model" in which poverty is viewed as a result of deprivation. Most community action programs accordingly delivered services and rarely if ever engaged in aggressive social action. As time went on, and the political climate changed, almost all efforts to bring about social change ceased and, in the words of Richard Boone, who helped shape the Community Action Program as well as the efforts which preceded it, the local community action agencies became "quiet little backwaters." (Boone, no date, pages 12-13).

Where the poor and the minorities may have been to a degree successful, is in assuming some authority over anti-poverty efforts in their communities. But even that appears to be ebbing. In many

of our larger cities, the poor never achieved more than a minimal input into the programs (Ridgeway, 1972) and where they did achieve a degree of control, they seem about to lose it. In Mississippi, for example, the governor has several times vetoed* a neighborhood health program, and there are some indications that he may attempt to take control of the Head Start and day care programs as well. (Washington Post, 9/17/72).

To some extent, the history of Head Start parallels that of its mother agency. Despite controversies that continually have swirled about its head, it, too, was largely based on the "deficit model" although in time the the decision-making role of Head Start parents was strengthened and some recognition was given to the fact that the developmental gains of children who participated in the program would not be maintained unless there were changes in other social institutions as well.

The history and development of Head Start, however, is only part of the foci of this report. Our major purpose is to cast some light on the intricate interplay of theory, practice, research, politics and bureaucracy which ultimately are the forces that appear to shape public programs. In this sense,the report can be looked upon as a minor contribution to the social history of our times.

A further, and originally narrower goal, was to review the literature on Head Start and related programs since their inception. As it turns out, the findings from this latter effort may

* These vetoes have been over-ridden by OEO.

prove to be of even greater consequence than our contribution to social history. For, as the data makes clear, and as we re-iterate throughout, there is virtually no information of any consequence on parents as decision-makers. By and large, the emphasis in the literature is on the parents as learners or as teachers of their own children. As one of the contributors to this report points out:

> There is no study of how parent participation in decision-making in Head Start changed Head Start programs or the ways in which parents played their decision-making role in the establishment of Head Start programs. Lacking is solid case material showing the development of the program over the course of the years in which the program's biography was written, and thus the insights into the change process. Needed therefore is not a rationale, but the means for measuring the application of the rationale."

It is hoped that in the future, efforts will be made to recapture that history and to explore its various dimensions. We all have something to learn from it.

* * * * *

For purposes of organization, we have divided this report into two parts. In Part One, we discuss the theoretical orientations which informed the development of Head Start and other anti-poverty programs; and the history and development of both the Community Action Program and Head Start itself. This part of our report concludes with a description and analysis of parent participation in practice but only to the extent that our knowledge permitted. Much of the material in Part One is based on

personal recollections of people who were involved in developing the program and thus is subject to the limitations which such an approach entails.

In Part Two, we review the literature of Head Start and Head Start-type programs. It is from this review that we came to realize how skewed the data on Head Start are and the need to rectify the situation so that the concerns about parents as decision-makers, whatever they may be, can be exposed to public scrutiny. Our report concludes with a summary and an analysis of the implications of our study for further enquiries.

A number of people contributed in different ways to this report and deserve our thanks. Ira Gordon developed the original review of the literature and pointed to the gaping holes in knowledge. An edited version of his report forms Part Two of this study. Arthur Katz gathered most of the material that comprises Part One of the study and developed the theoretical formulation we have used for our analysis. Dr. Katz also conducted the interviews on which much of Part One is based. Ben Zimmerman contributed additional material for Part One of the study and assisted MIDCO in pulling together the entire report. Joan Hurst edited and condensed Dr. Gordon's material.

Finally, we are grateful to the many people who gave willingly of their time and shared their experiences with us. They are mentioned in appropriate places in the text. In the end, however, this report reflects the views of MIDCO rather than any of the people who provided us with data and materials, and we take full responsibility for what frequently seems like disputatious material.

September, 1972
Denver, Colorado

Table of Contents

Chapter		Page
	Preface	i
	Part One	
	Theory and Background	
1.	**Theoretical Orientations**	
	Introduction	I - 1
	a. Deficit Models	I - 2
	b. Social Structural Models	I - 12
	c. Implications for Early Childhood Programs	I - 27
2.	**The War on Poverty**	
	a. The Rediscovery of Povery	I - 32
	b. The CAP and Participation of the Poor	I - 40
3.	**The Development of Parent Participation in Head Start**	
	a. Origins of Head Start	I - 50
	b. The Cooke Memorandum	I - 59
	c. The Shift in Guidelines	I - 69

Part Two

Practice: A Review of the Literature

Chapter		Page
1.	Rationale for Parent Participation	
	Introduction	II - 1
	a. Orientations	II - 5
	Individual Treatment	II - 6
	Social Change	II - 16
2.	The Engineering Framework: Psycho-Educational Intervention	
	Introduction	II - 29
	a. Group Meetings	II - 30
	b. Home Visits	II - 33
	c. Contingency Management	II - 38
	d. Affective Help	II - 40
	e. Perception as Powerful	II - 42
	f. Access to Materials and Information	II - 43
	g. Change in Life Circumstances	II - 45
	h. General Parent Participation	II - 46
3.	Evaluation of Parent Participation Programs	
	Introduction	II - 49
	a. Head Start	II - 50
	b. Non-Head Start	II - 63

Chapter		Page
	Summing Up	
	Introduction	S - 1
a.	Theoretical Orientations	S - 1
b.	Head Start Policies	S - 9
c.	Review of the Literature	S - 14
	Appendices	
a.	Characteristics of Head Start and Other Parents on Variables Related to Child Development	A - 1
b.	References, Part One	
c.	References, Part Two	

Part One

Theory and Background

Chapter 1

Theoretical Orientations

Introduction

Rationales for parent participation in Head Start are based on a diverse body of knowledge and assumptions about the family and its importance for the early socialization of the child, about the causes of poverty and its cures, about the nature of society and culture, and by extension, about the nature of man himself. Some of these assumptions derive from psychology, others from anthropology and sociology, and a lesser extent from economics.

In 1964, these various theoretical streams converged to produce not only Head Start but a range of other anti-poverty strategies. The goal of all of these strategies was to move people from poverty into the mainstream of American life. It is important therefore, to understand the nature of these streams for in combination with political and bureaucratic concerns, they influenced the structure and thrust of the programs.

In this chapter we discuss the two major theoretical orientations which have influenced all anti-poverty efforts. For purposes of simplicity, if not complete accuracy, we have labeled these orientations "deficit models" and "social structural models."

a. Deficit Models

One of the major explanations of poverty implies that there is something about the poor themselves that either causes poverty or keeps them in poverty. This explanation has a number of variants, some of which are highly controversial and anathema to the mind set of most Americans.

Among t) latter are the notions recently expressed by Jensen (1969), Herrnstein (1971) and Eysenck (1971).* According to these theories, the reason that Blacks do less well than whites in school, and consequently remain at the bottom of the social and economic pyramid, is because of a deficiency in their genes. (Miller and Ratner, 1972) This theory seeks to explain performance as well as inequality in terms of biology and therefore implies that social interventions such as Head Start are doomed to failure unless the biological deficit is corrected.

This theory has been widely condemned as racist and as harking back to the social Darwinism of the 19th century when the ideology of racism was first articulated and social analysts tried to account for the rise of capitalism, colonialism and slavery as a consequence of the natural superiority of the whites. Nevertheless, it is important to be aware of this development,

* Jensen has been associated with Head Start almost from its inception.

for there is a distinct possibility that it may become more widely accepted than it is now.*

The more prevalent view of individual deficits is usually phrased in terms of deprivation,** which means that people, either as individuals or groups, lack something because they have been hindered from acquiring it.

One of the more influential expressions of this point of view is that of Oscar Lewis, the anthropologist,who in the early sixties, developed the concept of "the culture of poverty." (Lewis, 1960) Based upon his field research in the slums of Mexico, India, Puerto Rico and Cuba, Lewis found that there were a number of traits, about 75 in all, which poor people, under

---

* There is also another kind of "biological" deficit. Recent studies have indicated that a lack of protein during the crucial early years of a child's development may induce mental retardation. This, however, is not a genetic defect.

** Many people, including Ira Gordon, make a distinction between deficit and deprivation. Gordon's point is that a deficit is something that is inherent in a person himself and thus is likely biological in origin: it is something a person lacks. Deprivation, on the other hand, implies that something has not been given to people or has been taken away from them. In a paper prepared for this study, Gordon notes:

> "Deprivation...does not mean constitutional (biological) inadequacy, but according to the dictionary, is a stage due to being deprived, 'taking away of what one has, owns or has a right to (the feeling that the system under which we live deprives the majority of a chance for a decent life -- C.D. Lewis.)."

The distinction is a useful one for certain purposes. In this report, however, we are using deficit in a broader sense to mean a "deficiency in amount of quality" which is how Webster defines it. This definition does not by itself imply the source of the deficiency; that is something which researchers, social theorists, or people in general do.

certain circumstances, share. These traits cross national and cultural lines and combine in various ways to form a "subculture with its own structure and rationale and...a way of life which is passed down from generation to generation along family lines." (Lewis, 1960, page 67)

According to Lewis these traits show "remarkable similarities in family structure, interpersonal relations, time orientation, value systems and spending patterns" (page 68). Among the major characteristics of the "culture of poverty," Lewis identified the following:

- The lack of effective participation and integration of the poor into the major institutions of the larger society. That is, as a group or class, the poor are marginal to the rest of society. "People with a culture of poverty are aware of middle-class values, talk about them, and even claim some of them as their own; but on the whole they do not live by them." (page 71)

- A minimum of organization beyond the level of the nuclear and extended family. "Indeed, it is the low level of organization which gives the culture of poverty its marginal and anachronistic quality in our society." (ibid.)

- On the family level, "The absence of childhood as a specially prolonged and protected stage in the life cycle, early initiation into sex, free unions or consensual marriages, a relatively high evidence of the abandonment of wives and children" and a variety of other traits. (page 72)

- On the individual level, a "strong feeling of marginality, of helplessness, of dependence, and of inferiority" (ibid.) Of particular importance to theories of early childhood development, Lewis noted the "high evidence of maternal deprivation, weak ego structure, a lack of impulse control, a strong present time orientation with relatively little ability to defer gratification..." (page 73)

In Lewis' view, the culture of poverty is "both an adaptation and a reaction of the poor to this marginal position in a class-stratified, highly individuated, capitalistic society." (page 68), In other words, the culture of poverty can only arise under certain conditions which Lewis identifies as (1) a cash economy, wage labor and production for profit; (2) a persistently high rate of unemployment and underemployment for unskilled labor; (3) low wages; (4) the failure to provide social, political and economic organization, either on a voluntary basis or by government imposition, for the low income population; (5) the existence of a bilateral kinship system rather than a unilateral one; and (6) the existence of a set of values in the dominant class which stresses the accumulation of wealth and property, the possibility of upward mobility and thrift, and explains low economic status as the result of personal inadequacy and inferiority. (pages 68-9)

In developing his thesis, Lewis distinguishes between being poor and the culture of poverty. It is possible, in his view to be poor, lack worldly possessions and even financial resources, but still not live in a culture of poverty. The essential ingredient that makes this possible is the development and adoption of an idealogy.

> "When the poor become class conscious or active members of trade-union organizations or when they adopt an internationalist outlook on the world, they are no longer part of the culture of poverty although they still may be desperately poor.

PS 006816

> Any movement, be it religious,pacifist or revolutionary, which organizes and gives hope to the poor and which effectively promotes solidarity and a sense of identification with larger groups, destroys the psychological and social core of the culture of poverty." (page 74)

At the same time, however, the culture of poverty tends to be self-perpetuating even under the new conditions that Lewis posits, for it "is not only an adaptation to a set of objective conditions of the larger society ... By the time slum children are six or seven years old, they usually have absorbed the basic values and attitudes of their subculture and are not psychologically geared to take full advantage of changing conditions or increased opportunities which may occur in their lifetime." (page 69)

Thus Lewis would seem to have it both, or possibly even three ways. The culture of poverty is identifiable through a number of interlocking traits; it has an observable structure. It arises only under certain social conditions, and tends to disappear or become less evident when these conditions change or people adopt a new world view or idealogy. Finally, it tends to perpetuate itself because of early learning experiences of which people find it hard to divest themselves: even under new circumstances, people tend to act as they had in the past.

It is, perhaps, important to note that Lewis did not feel that the necessary conditions to produce a "culture of poverty" existed in the United States. He felt the concept applied

specifically to agrarian societies that were moving towards industrialization. (page 68) At the same time, however, he felt that the civil rights movement in the United States was a crucial element in moving the Blacks in this country out of the "culture of poverty" and into the mainstream of society (page 74).

* * * * *

Whether or not they were directly influenced by Lewis or arrived at their judgements independently (the latter is more likely the case), a number of people have come to certain conclusions that are similar to his. By and large, however, these others have not analyzed, as Lewis has done, the conditions which give rise to this sub-culture or the conditions under which it tends to disappear. Their emphasis has fallen on the traits of poverty as they appear to be embodied in individuals or groups, and consequently the "cures" they recommend are intervention strategies to change people rather than the context which presumably controls their behavior. In this sense, these other theories represent the views of the dominant class in society which as Lewis points out "stresses the accumulation of wealth and property, the possibility of upward mobility and thrift and explains low economic status as the result of personal inadequacy and inferiority." (op.cit.)

Catherine Chilman, a former staff member of the Children's Bureau, and Warren Miller, a sociologist, in different ways represent this latter viewpoint. In a government publication called Growing Up Poor (Chilman, 1966), Chilman lists some fifty-

one characteristics which, in her view, identify the poor. Many of these characteristics are similar to those enumerated by Lewis. Among them are: fatalistic, apathetic attitudes; magical; rigid thinking; pragmatic concrete values; poor impulse control; little verbal communication and discussion; and high divorce and separation rates.

In Chilman's view, all of these (and other) characteristics should be changed so that the poor can become more like the middle class.

> "With all its faults, the middle class way, compared to that more typical of the very poor, seems to be more in harmony with present day economic realities ... Thus for the benefit of a number of the poor themselves and for the rest of society, methods should be found within the democratic framework to help many lower-class parents raise their children in a way that, in the light of available evidence, would seem to be productive of a greater likelihood of success and fulfillment in today's society.

Chilman also is critical of the poor in other ways.

> "As in the case of other substantial areas discussed in this paper, the child-rearing patterns of the very poor seem poorly calculated to develop 'good moral character' in many of their children... As in the case of the generally accepted criteria for good adjustment or positive mental health, so the characteristics of the socially acceptable child are solidly middle class."

In many ways, Chilman represents an extreme point of view. Nevertheless, it is a view that is one way or another is held by many people -- even important public officials -- and thus no doubt has had an impact on the way they view poverty and the poor.

Warren Miller would seem to share Chilman's biases, though he tends to be more objective in his judgements. In a paper that was widely read, and therefore possibly influential in the period that preceded the official war on poverty, he stressed the importance of lower-class culture as a generator of juvenile gangs and delinquency. (Miller, 1958). He also found that the lower class was characterized by certain traits (Miller calls them "focal concerns" such as excitement, autonomy, and toughness. Again, unlike Lewis, Miller does not indicate how these traits develop; they are generated by the milieu of the lower class itself.

In recent years, all of these theories, including Lewis's have been highly criticized. Many social scientists, appear to have rejected the "culture of poverty" thesis (Leacock, 1972) on a variety of grounds. Charles Valentine (1969), for example, notes that listing traits without noting the cultural context in which they are imbedded is not very meaningful. As Benedict pointed out many years ago, and reiterated throughout her career as an anthropologist, traits can be combined and re-combined in a variety of ways. (Benedict, 1922, 1949) By themselves they have no meaning. Traits are given meanings by the culture in which they are found.

Valentine would seem to share this perception:

> "Consider, for example, a demographic pattern in which at any one time there are many households without an observable resident adult male heading the domestic menage. This system may reflect a system of plural marriage in which

> co-wives reside separately and husbands live with one wife at a ti - ... It may reflect a community organization in which all adult males reside together and apart from their wives and children, as in much of the South-west Pacific ... It may be found in societies where males are migrant laborers for periods of years while their spouses and offspring remain in the home community, as in many colonial areas..." (Quoted by Ryan, 1971)

Like Benedict, Valentine's cautions relate to simplistic theories of culture and the danger of basing them only on observable traits, without relating these traits to a broader context. His criticisms, therefore, would seem to be directed more towards people like Chilman and Miller than to Lewis. At the same time, however, he is also critical of the Lewis formulation. Like many people he finds that many of the features that Lewis identifies "seem more like externally imposed conditions or unavoidable matters of situational expediency, rather than cultural creations internal to the sub-society in question." (op.cit.)

At issue here of course is the complex question as to what is culturally determined and what is determined by the position of people in a particular social structure. For example (and to simplify the argument), the fact that the traditionally in our culture men wear trousers and women wear skirts is a cultural phenomenon. (In some cultures, women wear trousers and men wear skirts.) But the fact that some people wear expensive trousers and others wear rags is not, in the same sense, a cultural phenomenon. It is the consequence of where they are locatd in the social structure and their access to good or ragged clothes.

* * * * *

Somewhat related to the Lewis's thesis, but at the same time different, is Lee Rainwater's formulation. To Rainwater climbing out of the "culture of poverty" is a matter of resources, not idealogy.

> "The cultural patterns of the poor represent after all an adaptation by people to their social and economic circumstances, an adaptation that is essentially successful and reinforced through daily experience. But provide the poor with middle-class incomes, and middle-class behavior will follow even though slowly -- because poor people share the conventional values of the middle-class and basically desire to conform." (Quoted in Sundquist, 1969, page 244)

It is for this, according to Rainwater, that a "service strategy" -- that is giving poor people services instead of money -- will not work.

> "A service strategy cannot be effective in the light of sociological analysis since it runs counter to the dynamics of the lower-class culture and behavior. The only kind of strategy that has a chance of really working is a 'resource strategy' that directly alters the life situation of poor people. (op. cit.)

In Lewis's view, however, money by itself would not be sufficient.

> "Increased income of the families that I've studied hasn't really changed anything ... The families may have better furniture but the treatment of children is the same. The people are still unorganized, still without faith in the future, still without a sense of belonging in the United States, still essentially dependent." (Quoted in Sundquist, op.cit., page 247)

The arguments about the existence or non-existence of a culture of poverty will probably go on for some time. Ira Gordon points out, for example, that recent studies indicate that the

poor are far from being a homogenous group and that, specific parent characteristics are more important than the class position a person or family holds in affecting the abilities and development of the child. (See Appendix A.) The important point to note here, however, is that in one form or another, the culture of poverty concept has had an impact on the way program developers view poverty and the poor and thereby has had implications for practice. As we shall see in later sections of this report, it is the "deficit model" that to a large extent, has dominated the development of Head Start.

b. Social Structural Models

The other major theoretical orientation that has influenced anti-poverty strategies is what we here call social structural models. These differ from the personal or cultural deficit models in that they locate the problem, whether it is poverty as such or some factor associated with it (e.g., school dropouts, delinquency) in some aspect of the social structure rather than in the lifestyle of individual or groups. The basic premise of this orientation is that if the social conditions and institutions which effect a person's life are changed, there will also be changes in his behavior.

We discuss this orientation under three headings: Institutional Change, Opening Opportunity, and Re-alignment of Power.

Institutional Change

In the late fifties and early sixties, a concern with making institutions more "relevant" and "meaningful" began to manifest itself in this country. Although the connections

are not entirely c[illegible], it appears that to a large extent this interest was stimulated by the growing civil rights movement and the problems of the inner cities. (Piven and Cloward, 1971). To address these problems, the Ford Foundation and later the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime, funded a number of demonstration projects. Although there were subtle differences in their approaches -- the Ford program focused on planning and coordination while the President's Committee program emphasized the development of competent communities through the application of new knowledge -- both were concerned with making institutions more responsive to people, particularly to the poor and the minorities.

Sanford Kravitz, who was program director for the President's Committee and one of the original staff members of the Office of Economic Opportunity, noted the following problems with respect to service agencies:

1. Many voluntary 'welfare' programs were not reaching the poor.
2. If they were reaching the poor, the services were often inappropriate.
3. Services aimed at meeting the needs of disadvantaged people were typically fragmented and unrelated.
4. Realistic understanding by professionals and community leaders of the problems faced by the poor was limited.
5. Each specialty field was typically working in encapsulated fashion on a particular kind of problem, without awareness of the other fields or of efforts towards interlock.

6. There was little political leadership involvement in the decision-making processes of voluntary social welfare.

7. There was little or no serious participation of program beneficiaries in programs being planned and implemented by professionals and elite community leadership. (Moynihan, 1970, page 69)

While Kravitz's concern was specifically with social service agencies, his criticisms apply equally to other agencies as well. It was during this period, for example, that it was discovered that the schools were not adequately serving the poor, either, and according to many people for some of the same reasons.

One of the most incisive studies of institutional relevance, and one that may have influenced a great deal of the thinking about anti-poverty strategies, was Cloward and Epstein's(1967) analysis of the disengagement of the social work profession from the poor.* According to these researchers, although tendencies in this direction had started earlier, they accelerated with the development of the public welfare system in the thirties. At that time, social workers and the voluntary agencies for whom most of them worked began to relate to a new clientele, the middle class, leaving the public welfare departments to relate to the poor.

In addition, and at roughly the same time, the social work profession adopted a technology -- psychiatrically-oriented casework -- which Cloward and Epstein contend was inappropriate for use with the poor since, in essence, this technology focuses

* Cloward and Epstein were both associated with Mobilization for Youth, a precursor of the anti-poverty program. In addition to its other activities, Mobilization ran an extensive program of research. The Cloward-Epstein analysis is one of the many results of this program.

on exploring with the client how he (or she) contributes to his (or her) problem and is only tangentially concerned with remedying the problem itself. Thus, social work, like the other helping professions, had turned its attention to individual deficits and away from social reform.

Coming at a time of rapid social change and upheaval, this and similar analyses drew attention to the inadequacies in a variety of our institutions. While not a theory in the sense that it explained poverty, delinquency, or the distress of the inner cities, it nevertheless, suggested one possible reason for these problems: The poor were not getting adequate services and the services they were getting were inappropriate to their needs. The "treatment" then might be to do something about the services.

It is important to note that this emphasis on reforming or improving service agencies was occurring at a time when a "service strategy" had become the dominant approach in social welfare. Starting in the middle 1950s and continuing well into the 1960s, the Social Security Act was amended several times to provide services to families on public assistance. The basic assumption behind these amendments was that services would lead the poor to self-sufficiency. As Bell (1965, page 157) has pointed out, however, to a large extent these services were never delivered. Others like Rainwater (supra) suggest that even if delivered, a service strategy would be inadequate to move the poor out of poverty, since what they need are resources, i.e., money, not services. Moynihan and a large number of other social theorists would seem to share this latter opinion, for that is basically what is behind the recent push for a guaranteed annual income.

Seen in this context, the emphasis on institutional reform, is (or was) an attempt to see that services were actually delivered and that they were relevant to people's needs.

* * * * *

Closely associated with the emphasis on institutional change, was Cottrell's notion of "interpersonal and community competence." (Cottrell, 1955). Cottrell, who defines this concept as "neither a trait nor a state" (page 49) writes:

> "Competence denotes capabilities to meet and deal with a changing world, to formulate ends and implement them. The incessant problem of equiping human beings to handle their affairs and to progress towards the discovery of new values and new means is not solved by authoritarian indoctrination of static attributes and beliefs. To rely upon such methods would not only be subversive of the most fundamental of American democratic values, but would ultimately result in the failure of the system which sought to maintain itself by these means." (ibid.)

In Cottrell's view, not only must individuals develop competence, but communities must do so as well.

The importance of Cottrell's ideas was not so much in the concepts themselves (few people have probably read Cottrell) but in the fact that he had a tremendous influence on the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime and thus indirectly on the anti-poverty program as well. As chairman of the Grants Review Panel for the President's Committee:

> "Cottrell brought enormous leadership out of his own charisma and stature... His credentials brought to the President's Committee high social science credibility...this reflected Cottrell's first experience in being launched into a national social policy position after a long and distinguished career in academia and in the foundation field..."
>
> "In the course of reviewing the grants to the 17 demonstration communities which the President's Commission made, Cottrell continually discussed his notion of the necessity for helping to develop the 'competence of communities' to deal with their own problems and always succeeded in building a bridge to that notion in discussions that were held by the review panel. He constantly directed the efforts of the review panel to looking within any proposal submitted by a community for the way in which they proposed to build 'community competence' to deal with social problems..." (Interviews with Sanford Kravitz and Aaron Schmais.)*

Several years after he had left OEO, Kravitz still maintained that 'community competence' was an important goal for the Community Action Program. In an article discussing this anti-poverty effort, he lists the following as objectives to be achieved:

- "To create competent communities by developing in the poor the capacity for leadership, problem-solving and participation in the decision-making councils that effect their lives.
- To restructure community service institutions to assure flexibility, responsiveness, respect, and true relatedness to the problems faced by the poor (Kravitz, 1969, page 66)

It should be noted that the notion of community competence is a goal or objective to be attained. By itself it does not sug-

---

* Aaron Schmais was a staff member of the President's Committee and later of the Community Action Program at the Office of Economic Opportunity.

gest a strategy for implementation. It is in this connection that the Kravitz memo we quoted earlier takes on an added significance; for it was Kravitz's contention that by instituting the measures he suggested, competence, in the sense of a community facing its problems and doing something about them, might result. These measures, therefore, form a bridge between the focus on institutional change and the focus on community competence.

Opening Opportunities

Closely associated with the theories or assumptions about institutional change as a way of overcoming poverty and community competence is the 'opportunity theory' developed by Cloward and Ohlin (1960). Although based, primarily on an analysis of delinquency and delinquent behavior,this theory had an enormous impact on the shaping of the anti-poverty program, largely through its influence on projects sponsored by the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency. This theory also provided the theoretical underpinning for Mobilization for Youth, in New York City, which is often cited as the prototype community action program. (Moynihan, 1969).

Derived in part from the work of Durkheim (1951) and Merton, who had elaborated on Durkheim's concept of anomie (Merton, 1959), the central premises of this theory can be summarized as follows:

1. Most persons who participate in delinquent patterns are fully aware of the differences between right and wrong, between conventional behavior and rule violating behavior. They understand the rules.

2. Delinquency and conformity generally result from the same social conditions. Efforts to conform, to live up to social expectations, often result in profound strain and frustration because the opportunities for conformity are not always available. This may lead in turn to behavior which violates social rules. The very act of reaching out for socially approved goals under conditions that preclude their legitimate achievement engenders strain.

3. Delinquency ordinarily represents a search for solutions to problems of adjustment.

4. Much delinquent behavior is engendered because opportunities for conformity are limited.

In this theory, therefore,

> "Delinquency ... represents not a lack of motivation to conform, but quite the opposite: The desire to meet social expectations itself becomes the source of delinquent behavior, if the possibility of doing so is limited or nonexistent ... In order to reduce the incidence of delinquent behavior or to rehabilitate persons who are already enmeshed in delinquent patterns, you must provide the social and psychological resources that make conformity possible." (Mobilization for Youth, 1961).

The difference between this theory, or set of assumptions and Durkheim's original concepts should be noted. Durkheim emphasized "unlimited" and "unrealistic" goals, as the following quotations show.

> "For if men are never satisfied with their position in the social hierarchy, if they are driven by unrealistic desires to improve their lot in life, then they may cease to be bound by the prevailing rules of the society." (Durkheim, op.cit., page 45).

> "One of the paradoxes of social life is that the processes by which societies seek to ensure order sometimes results in disorder.... Unlimited aspirations, Durkheim pointed out, exert an intense pressure towards disorder because they are, by definition, unachievable and thus constitute a source of 'uninterrupted agitation.' (ibid, page 82)

The reason we mention this is that recently a number of influential social critics have suggested that disadvantaged populations should moderate their goals and perhaps even remain satisfied with what they have achieved.* Miller and Ratner (op.cit.) summarize the arguments of this "group" as follows:

1. There is nothing wrong with America that lowering our aspirations won't solve.
2. Things are much better than people think.
3. The people are at fault not the society.
4. Things will get worse if you try to make them better.

It would appear that these propositions also derive from Durkheim, but lead in a direction vastly different from the "opportunity theory."

To return to the opportunity theory itself: Even more important than Durkheim's original concept of anomie was Merton's reformulation and the implications which Cloward and Ohlin drew from it. To Merton, unrealistic or unlimited goals were not the central issue. More important was the relationship between goals which a society set for its participants and access to these goals. (Merton, 1957) Here Merton distinguishes between two features of organized social life: the cultural structure and the social structure. The cultural structure consists of goals and norms commonly approved and towards which men orient themselves; it also includes the approved ways in which men reach out for these goals. The social structure, on the other

* Among the critics are Edward Banfield and Nathan Glazer.

hand, consists of the patterned sets of relationships in which people are involved. The division of people into social classes or strata according to wealth, power, or prestige is one important type of social structure -- it is ours, in fact -- and it is this that permits or limits access to the culturally determined goals.

To put this in the simplest possible fashion: An overarching American goal is success; we are all geared to "making it." If legitimate access to this goal is blocked, people will try to make it illegitimately. It is "making it" that counts.

As noted earlier, this theory became the conceptual base on which the program of Mobilization of Youth was based. The aim of the program was "opening opportunities."

> "The target for preventive action, then, should be defined not as the individual or group that exhibits the delinquent pattern, but as the social setting that gives rise to delinquency."
>
> "It is our view, in other words, that the major effort of those who wish to eliminate delinquency should be directed to the reorganization of slum communities...the old structures which provided social control and avenues of social assent are breaking down. Legitimate but functional substitutes for these traditional structures must be developed if we are to stem the trend toward the violence and retreatism among adolescents in urban slums." (Cloward and Ohlin, op.cit., page 211)

The implication of this approach is that the proper subject for treatment is not the individual, nor even the neighborhood where people live. Rather, it is the total social environment which sets goals and then limits the opportunity to achieve them.

Although propounded basically as a theory to explain, and thus overcome delinquency, the Ohlin and Cloward formulation exerted a powerful influence on other aspects of the anti-poverty program as well, particularly the Community Action Program. In fact, the notion that what poor people lacked was "opportunity" became an important theme of the program* and many of its programmatic strategies were aimed at providing them with opportunities they had missed or to enable them to participate in the workings of society which heretofore had been closed to them. In this sense, the "opportunity theory" stands midway between a focus on institutional change and the concept of re-alignment of power which we discuss below.

Re-Alignment of Power

A third approach to social structural change, and no doubt the most controversial, focuses on the basic organization of society. In this model, poverty is seen as the result of powerlessness by which is meant the inability of people to control or influence the decisions that affect their lives. In connection with poverty, the decisions usually have to do with the control and distribution of resources, either money, jobs, or services; or with plans and programs, that determine how these resources are distributed.

While the notion that people should be involved in making the decisions that affect their lives is a cornerstone of democratic idealogy, when people, particularly those who have no power, try to exercise this right, they frequently meet with resistance and hostility. To a large extent this is because,

*Note Titles: Equal Opportunity Act and Office of Economic Opportunity.

in our kind of society, power appears to be looked upon as a scarce commodity. It is something to acquire and then hoard. Consequently when people who lack power challenge those who have, it frequently leads to confrontation and conflict.* As Williams and Evans (1969) have pointed out, power is a closely guarded commodity.

It should be noted that this is not the way power is always defined in the literature on parent participation in child development programs. Ira Gordon, for example, uses the phrase "parent power" in a somewhat unique fashion. Although he recognizes other forms of power, his concern is largely with the self-esteem parents feel when they realize how significantly they are in affecting the behavior of their children. While this is a form of power -- any control over the behavior of others is a form of power -- Gordon's notion seems closer to parental competence rather than to the usual sense in which the word power is used. (Gordon, 1971)

Many people have attributed the feelings of hopelessness, fatalism, and apathy which are said to characterize the poor to their lack of control over their own destiny. Ryan, for example, notes that power "may be man's most central concern." (Ryan, op.cit., page, 242)

> "What he is able to make happen by his own will and his own action determines the quality of his life, indeed, his very existence. His belief in his own ability to stay alive, to

* For an interesting insight into this problem see Gordon, 1969, page 12.

> meet his basic needs, to make real at least some of his hopes, to nourish and raise his children--these are a direct reflection of his perception of his own power in the world." (ibid.)

Theories of power -- what it is, who has it, how it is acquired and used -- abound in the literature of social and political science. Floyd Hunter (1953) and C. Wright Mills (1956) see power organized in a hierarchical fashion, with ultimate power held at the top by a power elite. Arnold Rose, on the other hand, sees power as more diffuse. He feels there are a number of power centers each with its own elite manifesting "its power mainly within its own domain." (Rose, 1967) Regardless of how much these writers may disagree on how power is organized in the United States, for that is essentially what they are arguing about, they would probably all concur that compared to other groups, the poor are relatively powerless.

Whether or not such abstract discussion of power influenced the framers of the poverty program is a moot point; no one knows, although it is possible that the pre-eminence of Mills in the crucial years that shaped the program may indeed have had some effect. What is more likely, is that they were impressed by some practical applications of the "power of the poor" which, at that time, were receiving considerable attention.

In 1960, shortly before the formation of the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and during the period when the Ford Foundation's Grey Areas projects were underway, Saul Alinsky, the director of the Industrial Areas Foundation and

and the leading practitioner in this field, was asked by some neighborhood leaders if he would help organize the Woodlawn Area of Chicago.* Alinsky had already achieved some notable successes as an organizer and had a clearly articulated theory about power, powerlessness, and the poor. In Alinsky's view, there were only two sources of power, money and organization. Since the poor lack money, the only way they could achieve power was through organization.

Alinsky also understood the difficulties of organizing a low income neighborhood. Charles Silberman, who helped bring Alinsky's efforts to the attention of the public quotes Alinsky as follows:

> "The daily lives of Woodlawn people leave them with little energy or enthusiasm for realizing principles from which they themselves will derive little practical benefit. They know that with their educational and economic handicaps they will be exceptions indeed if they can struggle into a middle class neighborhood or a white-collar job." (Silberman, 1964, page 325)

As Silberman notes, Alinsky's basic organizational strategy is hardly that of "a conventional neighborhood organizer or group worker." (ibid). Rather, his approach is that of a trade-union organizer. He "appeals to the self-interest of the local residents and to their resentment and distrust of the outside world, and he seeks out and develops a local indigenous leadership." (ibid). His goal is not only to help the poor overcome immediate adversity, but to help them build an organization

* The actual organizer of Woodlawn was Nicholas von Hoffman who now writes for the Washington Post.

that wields some clout. Only in this way, according to Alinsky, will the poor be able to change the circumstances of their lives. In Woodlawn, he had considerable success. The organization he helped build not only stopped the University of Chicago from expanding into the neighborhood, but it was able to wrest numerous concessions from the city government as well.

Alinsky, of course, is not alone in holding this view of power. Kenneth Clark, the noted sociologist and educator,who was an important force in the development of the anti-poverty program in Harlem holds (or held) similar views, as does Herbert Gans, also a sociologist. Gans however, has doubts about its efficacy. His concern is with the backlash that direct assaults on the holders of power can engender, though he agrees that the inequality in the distribution of power is, as Ryan puts it, "the crucial ingredient in America's problems." (Ryan, op.cit., page 241).

Other people have criticized Alinsky for different reasons. They have pointed out that he has had as many failures in organizing communities as he has had successes. In the final analysis, however, the arguments about his approach have little to do with whether or not it works: apparently in some circumstances it does. The public policy issue is whether or not it can be supported with public or even tax exempt funds. Here the answer has also become clear: apparently not. As Marris and Rein (1967) have pointed out and as has Moynihan (op.cit) in another way, this is the one of the dilemmas of social reform.

c. Implications for Early Childhood Programs

In a number of papers written over the last few years, Robert Hess (1969, 1971) a noted child psychologist who has been influential in the development of Head Start, has pointed out the implications which various definitions of the causes of poverty and lack of school readiness have for program development in the early childhood field. While Hess uses an analytic framework that is somewhat different from ours, his models can be related to the theoretical orientations we have discussed. This section is drawn practically verbatim from his insights and works, although we have re-ordered his material to accord with our previous discussion.

Deficit Models

(1) The family is damaging. In this view, "the family is seen as hindering rather than helping the child's growth. Because of the child's traumatic, esteem-lowering experiences within the home, he passes a 'critical learning period' ... and later education cannot overcome this deficiency." (Hess, 1969, page 30)

This definition suggests that intervention should take place very early in the child's life and directly into the family situation. "Proponents of this model are likely also to urge that in some instances the child should be removed from the family." (Hess, 1969, page 30)

(2) The family is deficient. In this model the educational institution and the family are seen as allies, but the family is

viewed as weak or deficient and incapable of handling the child's early education. (Hess, 1969,page 34). To overcome this problem, enrichment programs are necessary to provide additional experiences either because the family is so deprived it cannot adequately help the child (the malnutrition model) or because the restricted environment in which the family lives has limited its experiences (under-developed resources model). "In other words, the child's culture may equip the child to function within sub-cultural limits but the school needs to intervene to develop broader capabilities that have not been encouraged." (Hess, 1969, page 35).

To address these problems, "the school should expand the child's knowledge of how to act effectively in the larger society /and/ attempts should be made to get the mother involved in the school's program and to expand her sphere of knowledge and influence, with the expectation that doing so will modify the child's home environment." (op.cit.)

(3) Cultural deprivation. In this conception, the low income child "has not had many of the experiences which confront a middle class child during his pre-school years and which help to prepare him for successful entry into the public schools.... Thus he is unable to deal successfully with early school tasks and finds himself getting farther and farther behind in a cumulative deficit pttern. It is obvious that a conception of this kind would lead to remediation programs for the child and to educational programs for the mothers" (Hess, 1971, pages 274-5).

In the opinion of many observers, this model describes a certain category of Head Starts. It is also borne out by the MIDCO field research as reported in the final Technical Report.

(4) Cultural disparity. The basic assumption of the cultural disparity model is that "the patterns in social sub-cultures are opposed to the dominant middle class value system. The school's orientation is toward planning for the future. There is an emphasis on abstract and objective discourse, on learning own sake, on respect for the law and private property, civil obedience, religion and on rules of propriety in sexual and verbal behavior. These values conflict with the social realities of the vernacular culture maintained in 'deprived' areas." (Hess, 1969, pages 32-3).

Hess is highly critical of this formulation, as we were earlier of Chilman's concept of the "culture of poverty" which this in part reflects. As Hess notes, it is hardly an adequate description of the poor. As an intervention strategy, therefore, he suggests that the focus be on the larger society and its values and that "education ... accommodate to cultural pluralism and ... the curriculum ... be adapted to include the need to transmit the community's culture to the child." (Hess, 1971, page 275). It should be pointed out, however, that much of America does not share Hess's views. Although changes have indeed taken place in educational institutions, the battle is far from won.

Social Structural Models

(1) Inadequacy of social institutions. This model relates to the one above, but does not place the onus completely on the disadvantaged; "the blame falls as much on the institutions of middle-class society. The children of poor households may have poor learning patterns, little practice in abstraction, and poor disciplines, but it is also true that teachers often are ignorant of the children's needs, have distorted perceptions of /their/ abilities, and lack the skills to teach them properly." (Hess, 1969, page 32)

This model suggests intervention strategies focused on institutional change. "The description of the problem changes from the 'culturally deprived child' to the 'educationally rejected child' ... The emphasis on innovative programs is toward teacher training and retraining, toward increasing the sensitivity of the teachers and their knowledge about the child's culture and his resources, on curriculum changes and mutual communication between the community and the school. There is also a focus on the role of community persons as teaching personnel in the hope that greater participation will produce reform." (Hess, 1971, page 275)

(2) The family mediates environment. This model emphasizes why the families are deficient, rather than how, and points the finger at the social system as a whole and emphasizes that the "low status and powerlessness of poor families in modern societies limit the family's influence.... For example, competition for scarce resources helps keep the poor in poverty; the lower class

individual lacks alternatives for action within the society; there is discrimination against ethnic groups and poor people; effort is often not related to reward." (Hess, 1969, page 35)

This definition relates to both the "opportunity theory" and "the realignment of power" which we discussed earlier. Intervention programs relative to this definition, therefore, should foster community organization and involvement in the schools in order to bring about fundamental changes in the system; in other words to redress the balance of power.

As noted earlier, we have re-ordered Hess's material, but we do not feel we have done violence to his basic formulations. Our point has been merely to illustrate the implications of theory for practice. In the next two chapters we discuss the way these theories interacted with political and bureaucratic practice to produce first the war on poverty and then Project Head Start.

Chapter 2

The War on Poverty

a. The Rediscovery of Poverty

One of the outstanding events of the nineteen sixties was the rediscovery of poverty and its escalation into one of the leading social issues in the decade. Not only did it become a topic for scrutiny and discussion, it also served as one of the organizing principles for a spate of federal legislation.* Although it is difficult to attribute this development to a specific cause or causes, in retrospect it appears that several factors were significant in triggering this interest.

One of these was the somewhat belated recognition that the composition of our major cities had changed. As a result of the mechanization of agriculture and the rise of corporate farming, over twenty million rural residents abandoned or were driven from their farms. As Piven and Cloward point out, "this vast movement took place in less than three decades, between 1940 and 1966, marking it as one of the greatest mass dislocations in United States history and ... comparable to the movement of twenty-two million immigrants to American shores between 1890 and 1930, a period of four decades." (Piven and Cloward, 1971, page 214)

* The Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act was passed in 1961, the Community Mental Health Centers Act in 1963, the Economic Opportunity Act in 1964, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1965 and the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act in 1966. In addition, there was a variety of civil rights legislation. In one way or another each of these laws focused on the problems of the inner-city, of Blacks, and of deprivation and inequality.

Although a majority of these new "immigrants" were white, the Blacks were, as usual, over-represented. In 1940, for example, only half of all Blacks lived in urban areas; in 1950, the figure was 62 percent, in 1960, 73 percent and by 1965, 80 percent.*

It was not until the end of the fifties and the early sixties, however, that the situation came to be looked upon as critical. What appears to have stimulated this awareness was the breakdown of social controls, as evidenced by the rise of juvenile delinquency, the increase in drug addiction, and an increase in serious crimes; massive unemployment -- the rule of thumb is that unemployment among Blacks is usually twice the national rate, and unemployment among young Blacks is four times as great; the extent to which young people in the inner-city were dropping out of school; and the rise in welfare caseloads, female-headed households and illegitimacy. (Piven and Cloward, op.cit.,pages 222-247).

In many ways, this list of social problems sounds like a litany which has been repeated for years. The point to be made here, however, is that it shook the consciousness and complacency of the country. The prevailing view of the fifties was that poverty and its associated characteristies were a residual problem that time and an expanding economy would solve. The fact that there

---

* Most of the Blacks settled in the larger urban areas of the North as opposed to the whites who tended to migrate to smaller cities, towns and villages, and often within the same state where they were already living. Piven and Cloward, op. cit., pages 214-215.

were large numbers of people whom "the affluent society" was by-passing came as something of a shock.

Closely associated with these discoveries, was the growing unrest and militancy among the Blacks. With the Supreme Court decision of 1954, ordering the desegregation of schools, new energies were released in both the North and the South, and expressed themselves in marches, sit-ins, other forms of confrontation, and significantly because of television, with "the whole world watching."

As Piven and Cloward point out, there were differences here between the North and the South. In the South, the issue was the caste arrangement of the social structure; in the North, it was discrimination in employment, housing and education. (Piven and Cloward, op.cit., page 229). A major source of discontent in the North was the urban renewal program which became dubbed the "Negro removal program." In Baltimore, Maryland, alone, over a ten year period beginning in 1955, 14,000 units of low rental housing were destroyed and an equal number of families forced to relocate to more expensive and frequently worse quarters. (Piven and Cloward, op.cit., page 287).

Thus, one set of the events that stimulated interest in poverty was the situation of minorities, particularly Blacks, in the inner cities and the growth of civil rights activity. Another was the "visibility" given to poverty through several books that had both an intellectual and popular impact. Although it is dangerous to credit any single book even a group of books with the sole responsibility for this impact, there are two which seem to stand out.

The first was John Kenneth Galbraith's The Affluent Society(1958) which drew attention, though not in those words, to the "paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty." Galbraith's basic point, and one which his title seems to have obscured is that the growing affluence of our society was not sufficient to eliminate poverty. Because of the pattern of our industrial development, the rapid advances in technology, and the requirements of our economy for greater and ever more elaborate skills, large portions of our population would be unable to benefit from our growing wealth. This thesis was echoed a few years later by the Council of Economic Advisors in its Annual Report for 1964, which noted that "... in the future, economic growth alone will provide relatively fewer escapes from poverty. Policy will have to be more sharply focused on the handicaps that deny the poor fair access to the expanding incomes of a growing economy." (Cater, 1968, page, 105).

The second, and possibly even more influential book was Michael Harrington's The Other America (1962), in which he argued that the poor had become invisible. "Even those who huddle in the cities have not been able to identify themselves or their problems so that others will pay attention. Unlike earlier generations who could aspire to break out, today's poor often inherit a legacy handed down from generation to generation." (Cater, 1968, page, 106)

Although "the other America" and "the invisible poor" soon became catch phrases, there is reason to believe that the book, and its detailed marshalling of evidence, had an effect on the highest councils of government. President Kennedy, himself, is said to have been impressed by its argument, with the result that the problems it addressed and a possible legislative response are said to have been the subject of the last cabinet meeting he attended before his assassination.*

A third event was far more mundane. In 1963, President Kennedy was looking forward to his re-election and both his legislative program and the economy were in trouble. It had already been decided to recommend a tax cut:

> "But as Walter Heller /Chairman of the Economic Advisors/ began to look beyond the tax cut and ponder the inevitable downturn in the government's rate of spending for defense, space and related activities, he recognized the combined advantages of a broad attack on the deep-seated economic distress that economists describe as "structural" (as distinguished from "cyclical")and that publicists have labeled "pockets of poverty". (Cater, op. cit., page 102)

Heller found a sympathetic audience in the President, who had been moved by the poverty in Appalachia during his campaign and had promised to do something about it. Thus it was on the night before he left for Dallas that he "gave tentative assent to Heller's request to proceed with a poverty program" (Cater, op.cit., page 102)

---

* President Kennedy was an inveterate doodler. On that occasion, he scribbled the word "poverty" over and over again on his note pad.

President Johnson, upon assuming the Presidency, and despite the fact that he distrusted the Kennedy "crowd" much as they distrusted him, was persuaded to go ahead with the effort. Accordingly, Heller began convassing the government for specific proposals. Apparently what he received was less than adequate, at least as far as the Bureau of Budget (BOB) was concerned,* for, as reported by Sundquist, by mid-December, "the Bureau was still 'foundering' in search of a theme and a rationale that would distinguish the new legislation as dramatically as possible from all that had gone before."(Sundquist, 1969, page 21)

It was at this point that the BOB made what in retrospect appears to have been a crucial move. It turned to David Hackett, who was both a close personal friend of Robert Kennedy and, at that time, Executive Director of the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime, and asked him to submit a proposal.

As noted in the previous chapter, the President's Committee was one of the significant influences on the anti-poverty program. Although a small program (altogether it was authorized only ten million dollars a year for a three-year period: Moynihan, op.cit. page 66) it had created quite a stir in both the Federal government and in the country. Impressed by Mobilization for Youth, it had provided funds to a number of communities to plan comprehensive programs to combat juvenile delinquency. Then, on the basis of evaluation, and competition, it awarded action grants. But even more important, in elaborating its concept of comprehensiveness it required participating communities to develop a conceptual framework which,

* At that time, the Bureau of Budget played a key role in coordinating new legislation.

theoretically at least, would focus the programs on a set of testable assumptions; devise an administrative structure that would coordinate all relevant new and existing programs in the community that related to its conceptual framework beam all programs on a specific target area or areas; and involve all segments of the community, including public officials, private agencies, and target area residents in developing and operating the program.

While the President's Committee did not in all instances succeed in meeting these goals,* its ideal model, within certain limits, was what later came to be called a Community Action Agency (CAA). In responding to the BOB request, it was this model that Hackett recommended.

The BOB accepted the recommendation immediately, largely according to Moynihan, because of its emphasis on planning and coordination. Since "/T/rue coordination, especially at the pinnacle of the system in Washington, is difficult if not impossible ... a number of the leading budget examiners ... perceived /the possibility/ of doing it from the bottom." (op.cit., pages 78-79)

> "In the course of a single week in mid-December aid to community organizations was transformed form an incidental idea in the War on Poverty into the entire war. The Budget Bureau staff first assigned for the purpose 100 million dollars of the 500 million that had been set aside in the budget to finance the anti-poverty legislation,but a few days later they had committed the whole amount.

---

* See memorandum by Sanford Kravitz, quoted on pages I-13,14 as well as Marris and Rein, op.cit., page 135.

> "Schultze* had endorsed the idea to Budget Director Kermit Gordon with a note that a better name than 'Development Corporation' was needed. The phrase 'Action Program' was found buried in Cannon's* original memorandum; somebody put the word 'community' in front, and the name was born." (Sundquist, op.cit., page 23)

This giddiness did not last. Neither the participating agencies (almost all of the domestic agencies were involved) nor Sargent Shriver,who was brought in to stop the bureaucratic wrangling, accepted the BOB's plan. One of the chief objections was the stress that the President's Committee placed on planning. It would take too long to get the program off the ground. What the President wanted, as did Shriver, was action. Specifically, the President wanted to respond to the rising demands and the problems of the Negroes.** In addition, there was concern about the basic strategy. The Department of Labor, for example, felt that the emphasis of the legislation should be on employment, not community action. (Moynihan, op.cit., pages xv, 99)

In the end, the bill that was enacted had something for everybody. "The Labor Department's employment program became Title I ... The Budget Bureau's community action programs became Title II. And so on." (Moynihan, op.cit., pages xv-xvl).

---

* Charles Schultze and William Cannon; both were staff members of the BOB. Note also, that Sundquist is not talking about the final outcome. The Community Action Program never became the entire war on poverty.

** For an interesting, if cynical, interpretation of what the political motives might have been, see Piven and Cloward, op.cit., pages 248-284.

Interestingly enough, during all this, there was little discussion of what was to become the most controversial feature of the law, the requirement for "maximum feasible participation" of the poor. Apparently the agencies were too busy divvying up the spoils and protecting their respective turfs to be concerned. It should also be noted that in the process, the coveted goal of coordinating programs at the top was all but abandoned. By legislatively assigning programs to different agencies (technically they were delegated), OEO was left only with the Job Corps, VISTA, and the CAP. Although the law mandated that OEO coordinate the entire anti-poverty effort, it was never able to accomplish this goal.

b. The CAP and Participation of the Poor

As most people know, and as Lillian Rubin(1967) has documented, there is absolutely no congressional history for the origin and insertion of the "maximum feasible participation" requirement in the legislation.* Except for a brief and ambiguous reference by Robert Kennedy, it was not even discussed.

Adam Yarmolinsky, a former Assistant Secretary of Defense who served on the Task Force that developed the war on poverty, credits Richard Boone, with inventing the phrase.** which true or not, is within the realm of possibility. (Yarmolinsky,1969). Boone was one of the people,along with Kravitz who was greatly concerned

---

* The technical language is contained in sec.202(a)(3) of S.2642 and in the EOA of 1964,which defines a community action program as one "which is developed,conducted, and administered with the maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served..."

** Moynihan is not sure. He thinks it might have been Frank Mankiewiz who, at that time was a Peace Corps Official(Moynihan, op.cit page xvi .)

about involving poverty area residents in the planning and management of programs. Their experience with the President's Committee as well as their knowledge of the Ford Foundation projects had convinced them that the only way to make programs accountable and relevant was to place consumers in key decision-making roles. (Boone, no date; Kravitz, 1969).

Moynihan, in trying to recollect the history of the CAP, suggests that the phrase was inserted into the legislation to protect the Negroes in the South. Under Title I, he felt where the programs were categorical -- Neighborhood Youth Corps, Job Corps -- Federal regulations

> "...could easily enough ensure that they would have their share ... But what of community action, where local option would decide how to spend the new Federal money? Inasmuch as the local white power structure would control the allocation of community action money, how could it be ensured that impoverished Negroes would get something like a proportionate share?... A simple idea occurred to someone present: why not include language that would require the poor to participate, much as it was provided that other entitites should do so? Then, later, if in a given locale it became clear that Negroes were not sharing -- that is, participating -- Washington could intervene on grounds that the requirements of the legislation were not being met." (Moynihan, op.cit. pages 86-87, see also Donovan, 1967).*

In terms of the intent behind the "maximum feasible" requirement, Moynihan waffles considerably. At one point he seems to imply that some people may have had sinister motives: "Subsequently this phrase was taken to sanction a specific theory of social change, and there were those present in Washington at that time who would have drafted just such language with pre-

* OEO, or CAP, found it difficult to enforce its guidelines. At one point, over half of the Head Starts were out of compliance with the civil rights laws. (Cahn and Cahn, 1968)

cisely that object." (ibid)* Another time, in reference to the President's Committee staff members, he notes:

> "They wished the poor to be involved in the program, but in the interests of therapy as much as anything else ... They wanted others also to become involved so that they too would care and in particular, they wanted to involve those who have the power to do something about the suffering and the poverty. It was as simple and decent as that." (Moynihan, op.cit., page 70).**

But this waffling illustrates one of Moynihan's essential points. No one knows for sure what the drafters intended by this phrase, or to put it another way, everyone involved may have known what he meant individually, but there was no overall consensus nor even very much discussion. In an article that preceded his controversial book, Moynihan posed this question directly:

> "What are they(CAPs) supposed to do? Are they to make trouble- or prevent trouble? Create small controversies in order to avoid large conflicts- or engender as much conflict as they can? Hire the poor, involve the poor, or be dominated by the poor? Improve race relations or enhance racial pride? What is it Washington wanted? The simple answer to these complicated questions is that Washington wanted a great many things that could not be simultaneously had." (Moynihan, 1968)

Kramer, in his "account of how 'maximum feasible participation' of the poor ... was interpreted in five San Francisco Bay area communities" is concerned with a similar problem. His book is

---

* The specific theory was presumably Ohlin and Cloward's "opportunity theory."

** Kravitz says that therapy was furthest from his mind. (Interview).

"an analysis of some of the consequences of an innovative but ambiguous social policy and, on another level, of an attempt by various groups to translate social and political ideologies into action." (Kramer, 1969, page 11)

The ambiguities are reflected in statements by other people as well, many of whom were directly involved in the development of the CAP. To Adam Yarmolinsky, for example, "maximum feasible participation" meant merely giving poor people jobs in the local programs.

> "... it was thought of simply as the process of encouraging the residents of poverty areas to take part in the work of community action programs and to perform a number of jobs that might otherwise be performed by professional social workers." (Yarmolinsky, op.cit., page, 35)

To Sanford Kravitz:

> "The clear intent was to substantially increase resident participation in program development and in the administration of programs at the neighborhood level." (Kravitz, op.cit., page 61)

To John Wofford:

> "It represented, at a minimum, an attempt to deal with the condition of 'powerlessness' that characterized the poor ... to the extent feasible in the local community, this sense of powerlessness was to be changed by giving representatives of the poor some real power in the development and conduct of programs designed to assist themselves." (Wofford, 1969)

And so on.

James Sundquist, in summing up the controversy suggests that the seemingly endless discussions on "what did he mean by that?" will get one no where. He notes that the drafters, or at least some of them, may have had many things in mind. At the time the legislation was being constructed there were three distinct strategies of reform being tested. (Marris, 1964)

1. The Ford Foundation Projects. These sought to work through existing institutions with the hope that they would be influenced to change through the process of coordinated planning.

2. The Mobilization for Youth Prototype. This went behind the power structure in order to organize the poor to assert and defend their own interests, although it also ran an extensive service program.

3. The President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency. These projects emphasized the application of knowledge through comprehensive planning.

According to Sundquist, "The planners of the President's Community Action Program did not choose among the divergent strategies; insofar as they recognized the divergence, they recognized, also, that no one pattern would fit all communities." (Sundquist, 1969, page 24)

Sundquist also maintains that the approach by the drafters of the legislation was frank and honest and that the language was clear.

> "Anybody who pondered for more than a moment the implications of maximum participation in program development and administration would be bound to envision poor people on board of directors of Community Action Agencies and as administrators or programs ... Furthermore, if the poor were capable of sub-professional duties, that was all to the good, and if they were capable of exercising power -- well, more power to them." (Sundquist, 1969, page 238)

Moynihan would probably disagree. If one may be so bold as to summarize his views (it is not easy), they go something like this: (1) Federal laws should spell out in specific details

what a program is supposed to do and how it is supposed to do it; thus his seeming predilection for categorical programs. (2) Although he appears to be sympathetic towards the poor, they are too unstable to be trusted. (3) What the Congress intended was for the Community Action Program to provide the poor with services. (4) The Federal government has no business sponsoring or supporting social action programs which lead to confrontation. (5) Social scientists should study the "hidden processes" of society,not tamper with them.*

In the final analysis, his basic complaint is that the Federal government cannot control a program that is based on local initiative, and since the Community Action Program, with its mandate for "maximum feasible participation" of the poor, went far beyond any conceivable intent of the Congress, it could only end disastrously. Specifically, he is critical of the militant social action efforts in which some local community action agencies engaged, since it seems to have turned the "establishment" including the mayors, the President, and even the Congress against the program.

If we have not set up a straw man, it is possible to counter some of these assertions, except of course, those that represent his personal biases. First, as to services: a study by Stephen Rose found that in the CAP as a whole, 94 percent of the projects were oriented towards "clinical, rehabitative, or remedial services." (Rose, 1970) Howard Hallman who reviewed

---

* This clearly is an interpretation. It is based, however, on a close reading of his book.

the program for the Sub-Committee on Poverty of the Committee on Education and Labor, came to a similar conclusion: CAP "appears primarily to have been a new kind of service program.*

As for militant social action, that appears to have occurred in no more than a handful of community action agencies. Again to quote Hallman:

> "Except for a very small number of communities, the Community Action Program does not involve a a predominate commitment to the strategy of giving power to the poor, of deliberate confrontation with established powers, of purposefully created conflict. This is a stereotype placed on CAP in its early days by a few articulate advocates of this approach and echoed ever since by journalists, who have not examined what is actually going on. Yet, this approach is found only San Francisco, Syracuse, and Newark of the thirty-five communities studied. All three were included in the sample because of the controversy surrounding them, but this writer does not know of any other communities where this approach predominates." (Quoted in Lane, no date, page 5)**

Jonathan Lane who is currently assessing the CAP experience generally agrees with him. He notes, however, that many "became arenas in which conflict took place." (ibid) But that as we indicate shortly is another matter. Lane goes on to say:

---

* Roland Warren, who evaluated the Model Cities program noted the same thing: "They all seem to have defined problems immediately in terms of a lack of sufficient agency services--with the predictable result that the program proposed was for more agency services." (Warren, 1971)

** Mobilization for Youth, which Moynihan uses as a prototype was, in the word of Jonathan Lane, "tamed" in 1965.

> "Probably in very few places did this conflict represent a major political threat to the local governing coalition ... /But/ there are examples of various degrees of conflict ... Baltimore would fit Moynihan's vision, though that Agency itself was not taken over by a "power to the poor" philosophy. It provided an arena of conflict by which blacks got into the political system in general. Kansas City was also involved in bitter conflict. Effectiveness in Kansas City seems to have been low, because the CAP there was not in the "big game" of city politics as Baltimore. Other agencies never had a searing conflict. Examples here (each quite different) are Atlanta, Seattle, Austin and San Diego. Some of these did have some vigorous "social bargaining" which probably involved more or less abrasiveness -- not always in middle-class style -- but that, as Hallman says,'is the process through which democracy solves many problems'." (Lane, op.cit., pages 5-6)

As Lane notes, in many communities, CAA's did become "arenas in which conflict took place." To a large extent, however, this was a result of a lack of "maximum feasible participation" not because of it.

One of the difficulties in the early days of OEO was establishing broad-based community action agencies. The central problem in all of them was the reluctance on the part of what has come to be called "the establishment" to include significant representation of the poor and the ethnic minorities on their Boards. In many cases, therefore, the confrontations had more to do with battles lost than won. It is true, of course, that in

time, as the poor and minorities became organized, they become more savvy and learned how to press their demands, even, in some instances, unto victory.* But that, presumably is one of the things that is meant by institutional change. It is standard operating procedure in American politics and is the way minorities have always become assimilated to the larger society.

In actuality, however, there appears to have been less conflict than many people have assumed. Apparently, also, there was little fundamental change. At the end of three years effort(i.e., by 1967), Kravitz, for example, felt that the CAA's had accomplished very little in this regard.

> "The random program efforts of the Community Action agency have generally had little effect on the large bureaucratic health, welfare, education and employment structures that receive the bulk of their resources independently of OEO." (Kravitz, op.cit., p.66)

In the end, the real problem with the CAA's may be that in terms of really benefiting the poor and doing something about the "paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty," there was not enough emphasis on institutional change and too much emphasis on changing people. For as Rose has shown (op.cit.) the CAA's remained rooted to a services strategy and what we defined in the previous chapter as the individual deficit model. The "misunderstanding" may be not so much about "maximum feasible participation" as it is about poverty itself.

---

* For a cynical view of some of these strategies see Tom Wolfe (1971). For a radical perspective see Piven and Cloward, op.cit.

Robert Hess made a similar point a few years ago with regard to Head Start:

> "The influence the family exerts on the child is a result of many pressures... that originate in the conditions of society. Perhaps changes within the family, if they can be effected despite conflicting pressures, can in the long run produce changes in the social and cultural environment. But it should be recognized that changes in the family may be difficult to bring about unless they are supported by programs of wider social and economic reform." (Hess, 1969, page 43)

In the next chapter, we discuss how these various stresses and formulations were worked out in Head Start.

Chapter 3

The Development of Parent Participation in Head Start

a. Origins of Head Start

Like many of the early anti-poverty efforts, Head Start was the result of a crash effort on the part of the program planners at the Office of Economic Opportunity. According to Mary Ann Beattie, who has written a history of the program, the idea for the program was suggested by Dr. Jerome Bruner of Harvard University during an informal discussion with Sargent Shriver, the director of the agency. The notion that Dr. Bruner put forth was that OEO should sponsor a program to prepare disadvantaged children from low-income families for entry into school. (Beattie, no date, mss.)

It is likely that a number of factors contributed both to Dr. Bruner's recommendation and Sargent Shriver's eager acceptance of it. For one thing, Dr. Bruner was (and is) a distinguished psychologist whose career interests focus on the development and growth of children. Secondly, studies had already shown that children from poverty backgrounds entered school with certain drawbacks: they did not measure up to the schools' expectations of them and tended thereafter to steadily fall behind. And finally, there was a feeling that early intervention was one way of breaking the "cycle of poverty" so that it was not transmitted from one generation to the next.

From the outset, therefore, and subsequent events enforce this impression, Head Start was rooted primarily in what we have previously described as the personal deficit theory of poverty. Although these deficits arose from deprivation, they were perceived as deficits nonetheless.

As a number of observers, many of whom were involved in the creation of Head Start, point out, however, there were other considerations as well. According to Beattie, one of these was the desire to create a vehicle through which a large number of college trained women could be utilized as volunteers in the national anti-poverty effort. (Beattie, op. cit.) This probably reflected Shriver's interest in voluntarism and his recent experiences with the Peace Corps, of which at that time he was also director. But there were also more specific political considerations.

As is well known, the anti-poverty program was controversial almost from its inception. It was attacked from both the left and the right. To Saul Alinsky, for example, the program was a "piece of political porngraphy" whose intention was to undercut organizations of poor people which were then in the process of formation (Alinsky, 1968, pp.171-179). To others, it was an attempt to deflect the energies of the civil rights movement into a system that could only weaken and moderate their efforts. To much of the South, on the other hand, it was a way of moving towards further racial in-

tegration, while to many mayors, it was a way of weakening their control over city government by funding programs to agencies and organizations over which they had very little to say. From this perspective, Head Start was a way of overcoming these objections. According to Polly Greenberg, it was a "political play to wedge the newly forming poverty program into the tough heart of the American public." (Greenberg, mss. no date.).

Whatever the motives, it soon became clear at OEO that some sort of program for young children was to be mounted. Events thereafter moved rather swiftly.

Following his conversation with Dr. Bruner, Shriver asked Richard Boone, a top official of the Community Action Program, to call together appropriate staff members and experts in early childhood education and child development to discuss the possible program. Although the basic policy question at the meeting was whether or not to invest a sizeable portion of CAP funds in a program for pre-school children, several participants recall that the discussion was heavily weighted with research-oriented questions. The major concern was whether or not a high-quality program could be quickly and cheaply produced on a mass scale.* There was some discussion of parent roles in the program, as aides or volunteers in the classroom, and about the importance of teaching them how to be parents, but hardly any discussion about the broader objectives of the Community Action Program. If this was addressed at all, it was in the context of the possible effects that a high quality program might have on the American educational system as a whole.

In recalling that meeting, Sanford Kravitz had this to say:

> "It seemed to me that the experts from the early childhood field had little experience in dealing with poor people. This group of

* The original cost was estimated at $140 per child for the summer program.

> researchers primarily had their experience with middle-class nursery schools and the only model for parent participation which they were familiar with was that of the parent as a cooperator in the co-op nursery school movement, essentially a middle-class development." (Interview)

Kravitz also noted that there was little discussion about the kind of theoretical orientation the program would take. "I think the commitment at that point ... was clearly to cultural enrichment -- essentially a deficit model or 'culture of poverty' orientation." (ibid)

The meeting ended with a split vote; only half of the experts felt that the program should be fielded. This was communicated to Shriver who, according to Kravitz, decided that "a fifty-fifty split was pretty good odds," (ibid) and a decision was made to move ahead.

It was shortly thereafter, at the end of October 1964, that Polly Greenberg recalls writing the first paper on what was to develop into Project Head Start. Originally, the program was meant to be a medical-dental-nutritional program, but in her paper she suggested that a nursery school/child development component be added, and that jobs for parents be included in the program. (Interview) The latter was of particular interest to Richard Boone, one of the more ardent anti-poverty warriors, who was pursuing the notion of using paraprofessionals in all anti-poverty programs.

It is important to point out that, at this juncture at least, Head Start was not being thought of as a community action program in the social action sense. Although its funds were to come from resources allocated to the CAP, it was conceived more as an activity, a new kind of service program, that might benefit children and also help take the heat off the barely viable CAAs. In addition, since many CAAs were having difficulty in getting organized, it was looked upon as a way of giving the national anti-poverty effect visibility. Who could fault helping poor kids?

The first official memorandum that called for the establishment of a Head Start type program appeared on November 18, 1964, over the signature of Jack Conway, who was then the Deputy Director of OEO. The title of the memorandum was "Cperation Buildup -- School readiness for up to 500,000 young children from poor families." Still oriented to the deficit model, the memorandum listed the handicaps of poor children which the programs were to address: health and nutrition, verbal skills, and critical limitations in early life experience.

This memo was also the first document to suggest that an eight-week summer program be viewed as the inauguration of a continuing program. Apparently this memorandum gave rise to considerable criticism both within the CAP complex in OEO as well as among the CAAs. According to Beattie, there was reluctance on the part of some of the CAP staff to endorse or support a program that, initially at least, would serve more than 100,000 children.

"There was a feeling that a larger Head Start program would seriously hamper other Community Action Programs planned for the fiscal year 1965 since the Community Action Agency funds would be infringed upon. There was the added fear that a large Head Start program in the summer of 1965 would create a precedent for followup programs that would curtail other programs and activities sponsored through Community Action." (Beattie, op.cit.)

As subsequent events show, these fears were, from the CAP point of view, justified. According to Kravitz:

"CAP agencies both on the federal and local levels found themselves being taxed for their Head Start programs. This meant that they were told that they had to meet certain kinds of quotas and it became a crazy business. Head Start very quickly became so politically sexy and non-controversial that Shriver decided to push it extremely hard. This meant that with a limited amount of funds that were allocated to Title II there was only one way that we could get this money in order to expand the Head Start program. Obviously, the money had to come from other Community Action activities."

"CAP agency staff members resented this kind of national program direction. There were a number of other types of national programs which the staff felt were desperately needed and the emphasis on Head Start was an infringement both on the local autonomy in terms of definition of their own needs and also in terms of a national emphasis." (Interview)

HEAD START

CHILDREN AND DOLLARS BY FISCAL YEARS
(Dollars in Millions)

FY	Total Amount	Summer Head Start			Full Year Head Start		
		Children	Amount	No. of Grants	Children	Amount	No. of Grants
1965	$ 96.4	561,000	$ 85.0	2,397	-0-	$ -0-	-0-
1966	198.9	573,000	98.0	1,645	160,000	81.9	470
1967	349.3	466,300	116.6	1,249	215,100	210.4	750
1968	316.2	476,200	91.0	1,185	217,700	192.0	719
1969	333.9	446,900	90.2	1,100	216,700	212.3	756
1970	325.7	208,700	42.1	768	262,900	259.5	897
1971 (Est.)	360.0	208,700	46.6	768	262,900	278.3	897
1972 (Est.)	376.5	208,700	48.9	768	262,900	290.6	897

SOURCE: Office of Child Development

The above chart indicates the growth of Head Start both in terms of budget and number of children served. Because of the lack of money for expansion of domestic programs, Head Start more or less "stabilized" in 1970. At the same time, the total number of children served decreased due to inflation and increased program costs (salaries etc.) as well as a move from part-day to full-day programs. At the same time,however, it should be noted that virtually half of the Community Action budget is allocated to Head Start. If nothing else, this attests to the importance of Head Start to the Congress, the Bureau of the Budget and the Office of Economic Opportunity itself.

There was also resistance to the idea of a "packaged program" since this seemed to contradict the notion that programs should be locally planned and initiated. According to Mitchell Ginsburg, who was a member of the Head Start Professional Advisory Committee:

> "There was concern in OEO right up to the highest level with Shriver on the question of to what extent there should be mandated substantive programs that were packaged for everybody and to what extent there should be the kind of community participation which might potentially lead to a great deal of program variation." (Interview)

Possibly as a result of this resistance, another memorandum was issued by Conway on December 17, 1964. By this time the name for the program had been decided upon. The Title of this second memorandum was: "Project Head Start* -- A Program for Disadvantaged Children Before they Enter School." In this memorandum the goal of the program was set at 100,000 four and five year olds in 200 to 300 communities across the nation. There was also some clarification in the memorandum as to how the communities would be chosen. Three criteria were mentioned:

- Those which show concrete evidence that parents want and will participate in the programs.
- Those that show potential for developing quality programs.
- Those which need help most.

---

* Judah Drob, now at the Department of Labor is frequently credited with naming the program at one of Shriver's famous late night sessions.

Thus the concept of parent choice (decision-making) and parent involvement was articulated at a very early point in the history of the program, a victory it would seem for the CAP people who were arguing for this concept.

When this second memorandum was submitted to Sargent Shriver, the staff was given the green light to go ahead. A massive public relations effort was mounted. Beattie describes the highly organized effort that was made to contact significant officials in every local community across the nation. This included mayors, city managers, county officials, welfare, school and health officials, and heads of community action agencies, among others.

> "To all of these a letter was sent over Mr. Shriver's signature inviting them to participate in Head Start and enclosing a card on which they could indicate their interest. To mount this operation, contracts were made with almost every mailing house on the east coast to provide direct mail services." (Beattie, op.cit.)

Mrs. Johnson, the wife of the President, lent herself in a major fashion to the massive public relations effort; and wives of legislators close to the administration worked at making personal phone calls to mayors in their home states, encouraging them to develop Head Start programs and submit funding applications.

The response was so great that it soon became clear that there would be no way to keep the program at the level of 100,000 children. Very quickly the goal became 300,000 and finally 500,000. When a tally was made at the end of the first

summer program, it was found that 561,000 children had actually been served.

Kravitz, who had some doubts about the possibility of mounting a program of this size, credits Jule Sugarman, Boone's Deputy for Administration and who was named by Boone as the key staff member to organize Head Start. In Kravitz's words:

> "Jule Sugarman deserves credit for the administrative and organizational capacity to produce what I believe to be probably one of the most significant phenomena of administrative and social organization of the century." (Interview)

Thus despite misgivings and confusion, within the space of about six months, Head Start was off and running.

b. The Cooke Memorandum

In addition to suggesting the scale and nature of the program, the memorandum which was finally sent to Shriver over the signature of Jack Conway, called for the establishment of a "national advisory committee of informed private citizens." The original committee consisted of:

> Dr. George B. Brain, Dean, School of Education, Washington State University.
>
> Dr. Urie Bronfenbrenner, Social Psychologist, Cornell University Department of Child Development.
>
> Dr. Mamie Phipps Clark, Executive Director, Northside Center for Child Development, New York City.
>
> Dr. Edward P. Crump. Professor of Pediatrics, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, Tennessee.

Dr. Edward Davens, Commissioner, Maryland State Health Department.

Dr. Mitchell I. Ginsburg, Associate Dean, Columbia University School of Social Work.

Dr. James L. Hymes, Jr., Professor of Education, Early Childhood Education Department, University of Maryland.

Sister Jacquelyn, President, Webster College, St. Louis, Missouri.

Mrs. Mary King Kneedler, Nurse, Assistant Professor, Development Evaluation Center, West Carolina College, North Carolina.

Dr. Reginald S. Lourie, Director, Department of Psychiatry, Childrens Hospital, Washington, D.C.

John H. Niemeyer, President, Bank Street College of Education, New York City.

Dr. Myron E. Wegman, Dean University of Michigan School of Public Health.

Dr. Edward Zigler, Chairman, Child Development Program, Department of Psychology, Yale University.

As can be seen the advisory committee was heavily weighted with psychologists, educators and people whose orientation was towards problems in child development rather than towards problems in community action.

To chair the committee, Shriver appointed Dr. Robert Cooke, Chief of Pediatrics at Johns Hopkins. The choice of Dr. Cooke was probably conditioned partly by the fact that Shriver, as well as the program staff, wanted to make sure that the program was not controlled by the early childhood educators. The chief reason for this appears to have been a desire to make sure that it did not become, in the words of Polly Greenberg a "downward

extension of public schools." In fact, "it had been with reluctance that the experts had declared school systems eligible to run Head Start programs at all." (Greenberg, 1969, p.6)

The initial functions of the Advisory Committee were to give structure to the program, to establish a budget, and to secure a director. It was this committee that established the cost of the summer program -- $140 per child, but later upped to $170 -- and prevailed upon Dr. Julius Richmond, at that time Chairman of Pediatrics and Acting Dean of the Up-State Medical Center in Syracuse, New York to become the director of the program. Inasmuch as Dr. Richmond was also vice president of the Child Welfare League, and a member of the Board of Directors of the local CAP agency in Syracuse, he could by reputation as well as experience, relate to a number of constituencies.

As Program Director, Dr. Richmond worked closely with Mr. Shriver and was responsible particularly for establishing relationships with the various professional organizations (educational, medical, welfare, etc.), involved in getting Head Start on the way. The actual administration of the program and the inter-governmental relationships were assigned to Jule Sugarman, including the major task of processing grant applications.

In addition to its initial administrative responsibilities, the Advisory Committee also produced the first set of official

guidelines for Project Head Start. Known, popularly, as the "Cooke Memo"* this document remained the only official statement of Head Start policy and goals until 1967 when Manual 6108-1 "Head Start Development Program: A Manual of Policies and Instructions," was issued by OEO.

In line with what had become conventional thinking by this time, the Cooke memorandum, in terms of theoretical orientation, reflected the deficit concept arising from the "culture of poverty." Its opening statement is unequivocal:

> "For the child of poverty there are clearly observable deficiencies in the processes of the foundation for a pattern of failure and thus a pattern of poverty throughout the child's entire life."

The memo spelled out the specific objectives of Head Start as follows:

- Improving the child's physical health and physical ability.
- Helping the emotional and social development of the child by encouraging self-confidence, spontaniety, curiosity, and self-discipline.
- Improving the child's mental processes and skills with particular attention to conceptual and verbal skills.
- Establishing patterns and expectations of success for the child which will create a climate of confidence for his future learning effort.
- Increasing the child's capacity to relate positively to family members and others while at the same time strengthening the family's ability to relate positively to the child and his problems.

---

* The official title of the memorandum is "Recommendations for a Head Start Program by a Panel of Experts," chaired by Dr. Robert Cooke, John Hopkins University, February 19, 1965.

- Developing in the child and his family a responsible attitude toward society and fostering constructive opportunities for society to work together with the poor in solving their problems.

- Increasing the sense of dignity and self-worth within the child and his family.

The first four of these objectives relate solely to the child; the other three, however, are somewhat more ambiguous. While they also relate to the child, they mention his family, and the last two objectives at least, open the door for a decision-making role for parents.

It is within these last two objectives that the rationale for the parent participation program seems to reside although clearly they are not couched in community action language. In fact it is doubtful that the Advisory Committee, or most of it, had a dynamic conception of community action in mind. For when details as to possible parent roles were spelled out, they focused primarily on the parent as learner or as friendly counselors and guides.

> "Parent participation programs should be designed as to:
>
> 1. Assist in planning the program of the center, its hours, location, program, etc.
>
> 2. Help in acquainting the neighborhood with the services for children.
>
> 3. Deepen understanding on the part of the center's professional staff of the life of the neighborhood.
>
> 4. Participate in the parent participation program of the center which should in part help parents deal with the general and specific problems of child-rearing and homemaking.

5. Provide supervision for other children of parents who are assisting in the center or are visiting the center as part of a parent education program.

6, Fill many of the non-professional,sub-professional, and semi-professional roles necessary for acomplishing the above purposes and for the general conduct of the program such as:

   a. teacher aides for:

      1. liaison with parents,
      2. escorting children to and from the center,
      3. conducting small groups of three to five children on trips,
      4. adding specialized skills like singing, playing musical instruments, painting,
      5. general assistance.

   b. constructing and repairing equipment,toys,etc.

   c. maintenance.

   d. cooking and serving food.

In reading this memo today, it seems obvious that parents were conceived of as adjuncts to the program not as central to it. They were to provide extra pairs of hands, in order to relieve the Head Start teachers of certain duties, much as teachers' aides frequently came to be used in the school system. Their specialized knowledge, as in item 3, was not to be used for self-help, but to "deepen the understanding on the part of the center's professional staff of the life of the neighborhood."

When the memorandum was issued, there was considerable dissatisfaction among members of the CAP staff as well as among certain members of the Advisory Committee. Mitchell Ginsburg, a social worker, recalls that a group of the Advisory Committee

including himself, Mamie Phipps Clark, Jacquelyn Wexler (then Sister Jacquelyn) and Edward Crump met with Shriver to explore the issue of parent participation and parent roles.

> "After that, there was developed for us some new guidelines that we took with us when we went on our monitoring trips during the summer of 1965.
>
> "I remember, for instance, that I went to Denver, Seattle, Portland and Eugene, Oregon since all members of the Professional Advisory Committee were asked to monitor the beginning programs. We were given a checklist of items that we had to look at, and one of these was on parent participation." (Interview with Mitchell Ginsburg).

Ginsburg also recalls that members of the CAP staff played instrumental roles in pushing for greater parent roles, as well as for a close connection between Head Start and the Community Action Agencies.

> "It was Kravitz and his people that pushed for parent participation. At points there were differences between the Head Start program staff as such and the Community Action staff, leading to discussion about attempting to pull Head Start out of Community Action and out of OEO entirely. Some of the Head Start staff, particularly the child development people, felt that it could function better as a separate agency. However, there were those of us on the Professional Advisory Committee that were opposed to this because we wanted to maintain

> the connection with Community Action... We did win and there was no recommendation made formally that Head Start be a separate agency." (ibid.)

Apparently, however, the differences of opinion were never successfully resolved, for as recalled by Ginsburg, the arguments about the nature of Head Start -- was it or was it not a community action program? -- surfaced continually at the Advisory Committee's meetings.

> "Some members of the the Committee felt that we were dealing with a program that was designed to do certain specific things like raising the reading levels of children. There were others who interpreted the program as part of the broader Community Action thrust of Title II.
>
> "This showed up in terms of the practical effects when we as Committee members went out to visit programs. I remember that some of my reports were extremely critical of a few programs where parent participation was not in evidence. I am sure that when other members of the Committee made their visits, the reports reflected somewhat different views. This area probably would have been played down and other aspects emphasized." (ibid.)

Without belaboring the point further, it seems clear that in its early stages at least, Head Start had definite opinions as to the role of parents or learners; the program was far less clear about parental roles as decision-makers. Both Stanley Salett and Polly Greenburg, who were associated with the program in its early stages feel that this was largely the result of the influence of the early childhood specialists, both on the Advisory Committee as well as on the staff, many of whom

were only tangentially interested in the program's potential for social change. It seems reasonable therefore, to ask how this latter dimension came to be so widely diffused.

According to many observors, this was largely the result of personal contact. Frequently mentioned is the influence of consultants who traveled far and wide to help implement programs. The consultants played a variety of roles. They were teachers and trainers of staff and parents; they participated in evaluation and monitoring visits; and they also served as interpreters of Head Start philosophy and program guidelines to staff, parents and interested community agencies. Depending upon their own professional orientation, these consultants pressed for compliance with Head Start and CAP objectives in parent participation.*

Also important were the OEO inspectors, particularly at the time that William Haddad headed the Office of Inspection. Although there was much variation in staff attitudes, the inspectors during the early days of OEO took as one of their main charges the implementation of the "maximum feasible participation" feature of the legislation. This was also true of certain OEO Regional Offices such as former Regions I(New York City base) and VII(San Francisco base) which had reputations for promulgating activist approaches. In other

---

* See Polly Greenberg, no date, and Beattie, no date. Information was also derived from interviews with Mitchell Ginsburg, Charles Mowry and Bessie Draper.

regions, parental involvement, particularly in the decision-making role, was less urgently pressed, though here and there, as in what was then Region VI (Kansas City base), there was a highly developed parental involvement program.

Some consultants have indicated that in the absence of firm dirctives and guidelines from Head Start, they relied on OEO/CAP issuances which kept mandating citizen participation in CAP programs. Since Head Start was part of the CAP complex, although like most of the national emphasis programs it frequently acted and was treated like an independent agency, it was felt that these guidelines applied equally as much to Head Start as to the rest of CAP.

Of particular importance was OEO Instruction 6005-1* which one consultant described as the "most valuable weapon in interpreting and enforcing the notion of parent participation." (Interview with Charles Mowry).

> "There is much in that document that needs to be studied in relation to its effect upon Head Start practice. I think that is a pivotal policy statement. In my work in the field, that document was really the basis for developing a strong case for parent participation. That document really was more useful between the time of its issuance and the issuance of the 70.2 statement than the manual. I think that as a policy and as a base for the development of participation in practice, it was the primary tool of consultants, of staff and of parents." (ibid)

There is also some evidence that certain communities were far ahead of either the consultants or the staff in articulating connections between the CAP philosophy and Head Start.

---

* Participation of the Poor in the Planning, Conduct and Evaluation of Community Action Programs.

This appears to have occurred in those communities which not only grasped the potential of the program but which had, or quickly developed, an activist orientation. In the long run, it is likely that all these factors and possibly others as well converged in different ways to promote, or inhibit, parent participation. In future studies, it is hoped that this can be explored in a more systematic way.

c. The Shift in Guidelines

In September, 1967, two and one-half years after the Cooke Memo had been issued, the Office of Economic Opportunity issued its first Head Start Policy Manual.

Although most of the manual is devoted to Head Start itself, the first page makes it clear that Head Start is not to be confused with other and superficially similar programs. This section of the manual does two things: It places Head Start in the context and philosophical thrust of the community action program and notes the special obligation on Head Start in localities where no community action agency exists.

---

*Manual 6108-1: Head Start Child Development, A Manual of Policies and Instructions, September 1967.

With respect to the first of these considerations, the manual defines the long-range objectives of a community action program as focused on effecting "a permanent increase in the ability of individuals, groups, and communities afflicted with poverty to improve their own conditions."(Emphasis added). And with respect to the second, it establishes the principle that where no CAP agency exists, the agency that is responsible for administering Head Start "is expected to follow the general principles of community action -- participation of the poor, mobilization of resources, and targeting of programs to the poor as if it were a community action agency." (Emphasis added again)

As far as the authors of this report were able to discern, this was the first time statements such as these appeared in an official Head Start document. Although a historical track to explain the reason for their inclusion is not presently available, some conjectures at this point may be in order since they may point to some possible avenues for further investigation.

One reason that comes to mind is the possible delegation of Head Start to HEW. As is well known, tension, and frequently friction, existed between OEO and other Federal agencies from the onset of the program and even before, during task force days. With the Department of Labor, it concerned the general thrust and philosophy of the agency. During the task force days, Labor had argued for a manpower strategy as the centerpiece of the poverty program* and there were additional

---

* See earlier discussion, page I-39.

conflicts over the role and nature of the Neighborhood Youth Corps Program and other manpower related activities which were included in the legislation. With HEW, the arguments were mainly over programs that related to education and other activities of OEO that might be defined as educational in emphasis.

Head Start was a particular bone of contention. From the time that the program was fielded and attained its initial phenomenal success, there were indications that the Office of Education felt that the appropriate location of the program was in that agency and not in OEO. One possible reason for this was that despite arguments to the contrary, Head Start was originally conceived as a "school readiness program"and was always judged as such by the Congress and the public at large. As we noted earlier, however, OEO staff, including Mr. Shriver, had great misgivings about making the program solely an early childhood education program. Although the importance of the educational element was never underestimated, it was always felt that to be effective, it had to be community and not school-based, since the schools had proved notoriously deficient in relating either to communities or parents.

Another consideration was a difference in funding patterns. Most HEW agencies channel their funds through the states. Although the passage of the ESEA(in whose framing OEO was greatly involved) introduced some signficant changes, it was nevertheless true that the traditional pattern of HEW was and is to relate to states and state agencies. OEO, on

the other hand, channeled its funds to local communities. Thus imbedding Head Start in a Department with a different philosophy was looked upon as potentially harmful to both the intent and nature of the programs.

While these were possibly the dominant concerns at the time, it is conceivable that there were other considerations as well. In 1967, the Economic Opportunity Act was amended to open the way for local governments to attain greater control over the CAP agencies. Popularly known as the "Green amendment", after Congresswoman Edith Green of Oregon who introduced it, local officials were given the option to convert CAAs into municipal or county agencies. As it turned out, relatively few local governments chose to exercise this right -- according to Congresswoman Green because the guidelines made it difficult for them to do so. Nevertheless, it was of considerable concern to OEO which favored the community-based agency as the appropriate vehicle for its efforts. By transferring Head Start to HEW, there was understandable concern that the ties with the CAP agencies might be loosened and since in many communities, Head Start was the centerpiece, if not the sole effort of the community action agency, this was viewed with consternation if not alarm.

A final consideration may have been the social ferment which by 1967 had overtaken the nation. The Black movement had taken a new tack. There were calls for Black power, for community control of local institutions, for ethnic relevance.

Very soon Chicano groups were to organize themselves and Indians. In many ways, these were the natural constituencies of OEO, and certainly in local communities they were, or were shortly to become, forces to be reckoned with. Although OEO was frequently antagonistic towards these groups -- the OEO official philosophy was basically integrationist and reformist; except in a few communities it was not radical at all except to those people who regard any kind of change that benefits the poor and minority groups as radical -- it is very possible that part of the intent of these policy statements was to leave the way open to work with these groups as a way of reducing the polarization that was then becoming so evident in our society.

As noted at the outset of this discussion, these are conjectures. But they may point the way to fruitful research and investigation particularly for those who wish to discover the impact of social forces on public programs.

To return, however, to the guidelines: Except for the first section, Manual 6108-1 is concerned mainly with explicating Head Start policies themselves. The manual defines Head Start as "a program for the economically disadvantaged pre-school child based on the philosophy that:

1. a child can benefit most from a comprehensive interdisciplinary attack on his problems at the local level; and

2. the child's entire family as well as the community must be involved in solving his problems."

The manual then lists twelve specific goals for Head Start. Of these, the first four relate to the improvement of the child's health, emotional and social development, cognitive development, and socio-cultural development. Towards the end of the listing however, three goals have implications for parent participation. These are:

- o Developing in the child and his family a responsibility towards society and fostering feelings of belonging to a community.
- o Planning activities which allow groups from every social, ethnic, and economic level in the community to join together with the poor in solving problems.
- o Helping both the child and his family to a greater confidence, self-respect, and dignity.

Although couched in somewhat different words, these statements essentially reiterate the concepts set forth in the Cooke memo two years earlier. At the same time, however, the manual includes additional material which represent significant shifts in official Head Start policy. In a section on the role of parents, the manual notes that: "Every Head Start program must have effective parent participation."

This section also defines four modes of participation:

1. Participation in the process of making decisions about the nature and operation of the program;
2. Participation in the classroom as paid employees, volunteers, or observers;
3. Welcoming center staffs into their homes for discussions for the ways in which a parent can contribute to the child's development at home;

4. Educational activities for the parents which they have helped to develop.

Items 2, 3, and 4 are drawn directly from the 1965 Cooke memo. The significant change is the addition of the first item, the decision-making role. It not only has been specifically mentioned, it appears at the top of the list. It should be noted, however, that the manual discusses this role only in relation to Head Start itself. It does not extend the discussion to decision-making in other arenas.

Nevertheless, the manual visualized strengthening parental roles in the program in a variety of ways. It recommended a staffing formula for parent involvement and a linked set of advisory committees through which parents would be able to influence the program at all levels.* Subsequently, a parent involvement workbook** for staff, called for a parent program coordinator at the grantee level, a parent program developer at the delegate agency level, and parent program assistant at the center or classroom level, and in connection with the latter, a parent committee at the classroom level composed totally of parents; a parent advisory committee at the center level of which at least 50 percent were parents; a policy advisory committee at the delegate agency level of which at least 50 percent again were parents, and another policy advisory committee at the grantee level with a similar representation of parents. Significantly, the recommendation in the workbook was that at each

*A National Head Start Advisory Committee was formed in July, 1972, by action of the Secretary of DHEW to advise the Director of Head Start.

**Parent Involvement: A workbook of training tips for Head Start Staff, 1969, p. 10.

level, the parents should be elected to their posts.

The 1967 amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act appears to have provided the added basis, or mandate, for further action by Project Head Start personnel. In the reference to Head Start* as a program to be focused upon children who have not reached the age of compulsory school attendance, the Act serves "to clarify the intention of HEW and OEO to facilitate the involvement of parents of Head Start children. . . ."**

The Act states that Head Start "...will provide for direct participation of the parents of such children in the development, conduct and overall program direction at the local level."***

*Public Law 90-22, December 23, 1967, Part B, Section 222 (I) (B).

**OCD Transmittal Notice, 70.2, August 10, 1972.

***Public Law 90-22, op. cit.

The most specific approach to a philosophical statement about parent participation appears in a revision of the manual known as Instruction I-30, Section B-2, dated 8/10/70. In the transmittal notice of the revision, the following statement appears:

> "If Head Start children are to reach their full potential, there must be an opportunity for Head Start parents to influence the character of programs affecting the development of their children. The organizational structure of every Head Start program must provide this opportunity by increasing the effectiveness of parent participation in the planning and implementation of programs on the local level in order that parents may also become more effective in bringing about positive change in the lives of their children." (Transmittal notice, page 1)

Once more the major objective for parent participation in Head Start was stated as providing an opportunity for parents to influence the program. The assumption is made that only by meeting this objective will the child development program become maximally effective and therefore allow the ultimate objective for children (reaching their fullest potential) to materialize. There is also a secondary objective, one that relates to human development goals for parents themselves. The implication here is that if the Head Starts promote effective parent participation, the parents can utilize these experiences to gain greater personal and interpersonal competence.

But the major change in this revision is the extent to which it underscores the change agent function of the Head Start program itself. There are three major statements in this regard.

The first focuses on the importance of maintaining the developmental gains made by children in Head Start and notes that the soundest manner for this to take place is for the child's family to understand the nature of these changes and to provide continuity for these developmental changes within the family and the community. This emphasizes the notion of transferability and continuity of child development processes from the Head Start center to the family and other environments that effect the child.

The second points to change itself as a sound prerequisite for growth:

> "Many of the benefits of Head Start are rooted in 'change.' The changes must take place in the family itself, in the community, and in the attitudes of people and institutions that have an impact on both." (Instruction, page 1)

The third statement is probably the most crucial of all since it provides the most comprehensive rationale for defining parent participation objectives in Head Start:

> "Successful parental involvement enters into every part of Head Start, influences other anti-poverty programs, helps bring about changes in institutions in the community, and works toward altering the social conditions that have formed the systems that surround the econocially disadvantaged child and his family." (ibid)

It should be noted, however, that these statements appear either in the transmittal notice that accompanied the Instruction or in the Introduction to the Instruction itself. In terms of the body of the Instruction, the emphasis is exclusively on the role of parents in the Head Start program only.

Still, the changes contained in the Instruction show a steady progression towards increased parental influence. For example, at the center level, the committee was to be composed entirely of parents whose children were currently enrolled at the center. Furthermore,at each of the higher levels -- delegate agency and grantee -- the elected parents were given a vetc power over the other 50 per cent, the community representatives who also served on the Council. Finally, the word advisory was dropped from both the committees and the Councils: they became policy bodies, period.

These were significant changes and probably reflect a greater understanding of the program as well as pressures both from within the bureaucracy and from the Head Start complex itself.* At the same time, however, one wonders to what extent these guidelines, or even those in the manual, have actually been followed. Neither, for example, contain enforcement provisions: Head Start grantees were not given a timetable for compliance, nor do there appear to be penalties for non-compliance. This suggests that the guidelines could be construed as suggestions rather than rules, and

* The transmittal notice for Instruction I-30 states: "These guidelines have been developed in response to the numerous requests received during the past three years from Head Start parents, staff and administrators for more specific delineation of their functions and responsibilities in local programs." (page 1)

and there is some evidence that this in fact may be the case. A recent study by the Southeastern Education Laboratory, for example, states: "We have the legal provisions, and often, as in Head Start, requirements to involve parents in pre-school programs, but to a great extent this is not happening." (Southeastern Educational Laboratory, 1971, page 16)

Charles Mowry, a Head Start consultant, has suggested a possible reason for this: parents may not have been informed of their rights. It is not unusual for a Head Start grantee -- even a CAP agency -- either by intention or neglect to withhold information. (Interview)

Yet, these caveats not withstanding, several important principles emerge from this review. Although we couch them in ideal terms, these principles can be identified as follows:

1. Parent involvement cannot be seen as merely one isolated component within a Head Start program representing a particular service which can be delivered in a more or less finite fashion, such as health or dental service or nutrition. Rather, parent involvement is projected as an overarching and potentially integrating program force which is larger than any one component. It represents more than a program specialization; it is a point of view about how the program should be organized, administered, and how all other services should be planned and delivered.

2. Parent involvement should culminate in activities which are connected to and potentially can influence and affect other anti-poverty programs in the local community. Parent involvement, therefore, represents a method of connecting Head Start to the community action network or system so there can be a coordinated attack upon the problems of poverty. In effect, parent participation is Head Start's link to a total community action anti-poverty program.

3. Parent involvement represents the key to meeting Head Start's objective for institutional change which has as its purpose community action to eliminate poverty. Institutional change may be directed towards a variety of sub-systems such as public welfare or education. Head Start as an integral anti-poverty program must relate to fundamental community action program principles and must be directed towards influencing and changing those institutions identified with either contributing to the perpetuation of poverty or attempts by people to break out of the poverty cycle.

Although there was a steady progression towards these principles from the Cooke memo of 1965 to the 1967 Manual, the revisions that were added in 1970, and particuarly the context for the revisions as contained in the Transmittal Notice and the Introduction to the Instruction, appear like a dramatic breakthrough.

> "Every Head Start program is obligated to provide the channels through which /parental/ participation and involvement can be provided for and enriched.
>
> "Unless this happens, the goals of Head Start will not be achieved and the program itself will remain a creative experience for the preschool child in a setting that is not reinforced by needed change in social systems into which the child will move after this Head Start experience.
>
> "This sharing of decisions for the future is one of the primary aims of parent participation and involvement in project Head Start." (Instruction, pages 1 and 2)

REFERENCES---PART I

Alinsky, Saul. "The War on Poverty---Political Pornography", in Poverty: Power and Politics edited by Chaim Isaac Waxman. New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1968

Beattie, Mary Ann. "The Story of Head Start, Summer 1965", unpublished paper, no date.

Benedict, Ruth. "The Vision in Plains Culture", American Anthropologist, XXIV, No. 1, 1922

Benedict, Ruth. "Child Rearing in Certain European Countries", American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, XIV, No. 2, 1949

Bloom, B. Stability and Change in Human Characteristics, New York: Wiley, 1964

Boone, Richard. "Reflections on Citizen Participation and the Economic Opportunity Act", Paper presented at the National Academy of Public Administration's Conference on Crisis, Conflict, and Creativity, no date.

Cahn, Edgar S. and Cahn, Jean Camper. "The New Sovereign Immunity", Harvard Law Review, 1968

Cater, Douglass. "The Politics of Poverty" in Poverty: Power and Politics edited by Chaim Isaac Waxman. New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1968

Chilman, Catherine. Growing Up Poor. Washington, D.C.: Welfare Administration, Publication No. 13., USGPO, 1966

Cloward, Richard A. and Epstein, Irwin. "Private Social Welfare's Disengagement from the Poor: The Case of the Family Adjustment Agencies" in Community Action Against Poverty edited by George A. Brager and Francis P. Purcell. New Haven: College and University Press, 1967

Cloward, Richard A. and Ohlin, Lloyd E. Delinquency and Opportunity: A Theory of Delinquent Gangs. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1960

Coleman, James S. "Equality of Educational Opportunity". Washington, D.C., 1966

Cottrell, Leonard and Foote, Nelson N. Identity and Interpersonal Competence. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955

Donovan, John C. The Politics of Poverty. New York: Pegasus, 1967

Durkheim, Emile. Suicide: A Study in Sociology. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1951

Eysenck, H.J. Race, Intelligence and Society. London: 1971

Galbraith, John Kenneth. The Affluent Society. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1958

Gordon, Ira. On Early Learning: The Modifiability of Human Potential. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA, 1971

Greenberg, Polly. The Devil Has Slippery Shoes. Toronto: The MacMillan Company, 1969

Greenberg, Polly. "Comments on Head Start's Original Objectives: A National Impact". Unpublished mss.

Grotberg, Edith. Day Care: Resources for Decisions. Washington, D.C.: Office of Economic Opportunity, 1971

Harrington, Michael. The Other America: Poverty in the United States. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1962

Herrnstein, Richard. "The I.Q.". Atlantic, September, 1971

Hess, R., Block, M., Costello, J., Knowles, R.T., and Largay,D. "Parent Involvement in Early Education" in Day Care: Resources for Decisions, edited by Edith Grotberg. Washington, D.C.: Office of Economic Opportunity, 1971

Hess, Robert D. "Parental Behavior and Children's School Achievement: Implications for Head Start", in Critical Issues in Research Related to Disadvantaged Children, edited by Edith Grotberg, Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1969

Hunter, Floyd. Community Power Structure. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1959

Jencks, Christopher and Bane, Mary Jo. "The Schools and Equal Opportunity". Saturday Review, September 16, 1972

Jencks, Christopher et al. Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America. New York: Basic Books, 1972

Jensen, Arthur R. "How Much Can We Boost I.Q. and Scholastic Achievement?". Harvard Education Review, Winter, 1969

Kagan, J. and Moss, H.A. Birth to Maturity. New York: Wiley, 1962

Kirschner Associates, Inc. A National Survey of the Parent Child Centers Program. Washington, D.C. , 1970

Kramer, Ralph M. Participation of the Poor. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc., 1969

Kravitz, Sanford J. "Community Action Programs" in On Fighting Poverty: Perspectives from Experience, edited by James. L. Sundquist. New York: Basic Books Inc., 1969

Lane, Jonathan. "Race, Politics, and Community". Unpublished mss.

Leacock, E., editor. The Culture of Poverty: A Critique. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1971

Lewis, Hylan. "Culture, Class and Family Life" in Ross, A. and Hill, H., eds., Employment, Race and Poverty. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World Inc., 1967

Lewis, Oscar. "The Culture of Poverty", in his Anthropological Essays. New York: Random House, 1960

Marris, Peter. "The Strategies of Reform". Paper delivered at Conference on Community Development. San Juan: 1964

Marris, Peter and Rein, Martin. Dilemmas of Social Reform. New York: Athertom Press, 1967

Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957

Miller, S.M. and Ratner, Ronnie Steinberg. "The American Resignation: The New Assault on Equality". Social Policy, May/June, 1972

Miller, Warren. "Lower Class Culture as a Generating Milieu of Gang Delinquency". Journal of Social Issues, 1958

Mills, C. Wright. The Power Elite. New York: Oxford University Press, 1956

Mobilization for Youth, Inc., A Proposal for the Prevention and Control of Delinquency by Expanding Opportunities. New York: Mobilization for Youth, Inc., 1961

Moynihan, Daniel P. "What Is 'Community Action'?", The Public Interest, 1966

Moynihan, Daniel P. Maximum Feasible Misunderstanding. New York: The Free Press, 1970

Pivin, Frances Fox and Cloward, Richard A. Regulating the Poor: The Functions of Public Welfare. New York: Pantheon Books, 1971

Rainwater, Lee. see Sundquist, James P.

Rose, Arnold M. The Power Structure: Political Process in American Society. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967

Rose, Stephen M. Community Action Programs: The Relation Between Initial Conception of the Poverty Problem, Derived Intervention Strategy and Program Implementation. Ph. D. Thesis, Florence Heller Graduate School of Advanced Studies in Social Welfare, 1970

Rubin, Lillian. "Maximum Feasible Participation: The Origins, Implications and Present Status". Poverty and Human Resources Abstracts, 1967

Ryan, William. Blaming the Victim. New York: Vintage Books, 1971

Silberman, Charles. Crisis in Black and White. New York: Random House, 1964

Southeastern Education Laboratory. "Parent Participation in Pre-School Day Care", 1971

Sundquist, James P., ed. On Fighting Poverty: Perspectives from Experience. New York: Basic Books Inc., 1969

Valentine, Charles. Culture and Poverty: Critique and Counter-Proposals. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969.

Warren, Roland. "The Model Cities Program: Assumptions, Experience, Implications". Paper presented at the Annual Forum Program, National Conference on Social Welfare. Dallas, 1971

Williams, Walter and Evans, John W. "The Politics of Evaluation: The Case of Head Start", in The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, 1969

Wolfe, Tom. Radical Chic and Mau-Mauing the Flak Catchers. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1970

Wofford, John. "The Politics of Local Responsibility", in On Fighting Poverty: Perspectives from Experience edited by James L. Sundquist. New York: Basic Books, 1969

Yarmolinsky, Adam. "The Beginnings of OEO" in On Fighting Poverty: Perspectives from Experience, edited by James L. Sundquist. New York: Basic Books Inc., 1969

Part Two

Practice: A Review of the Literature

Chapter 1

Rationales for Parent Participation

Introduction

Although the development of Head Start in the context of the war on poverty tells us a great deal about the forces which shaped the program, there were other developments during the same period that are also crucial for an understanding of the program.

Of particular significance is the extensive research in the early childhood field which has occurred during the past decade. Perhaps the most startling finding -- startling in the combined sense that it was not anticipated, is still not fully accepted, and is perhaps the most quoted single finding in the field -- was Bloom's assertion that children by the age of four reach 50 percent of their intellectual potential. (Bloom, 1964)

But equally as significant as the findings -- and we shall have more to say about them later -- is the amount of research that has been done. In the recent OEO publication Day Care: Resources for Decisions there are 965 bibliographical references; of these, only 181 pre-date the year 1960. Roughly calculated, this means that about 80 percent of the research in early childhood, or at least the research which the authors felt was sufficiently significant to include in their bibliographies, was accomplished during the last decade. (Grotberg, 1970)

The scope of the research is equally impressive. Again using Dr. Grotberg's compendium, and applying the same measure as above, the following summary is a rough indication of what has been going on in the field.

Subject	Number of Bibliographical References
Part I - Orientation to Day Care	
International Day Care: A Selective Review and Psychoanalytic Critique	56
Day Care Programs in Demark and Czechoslovakia	--
Child Care Facilities and the Israeli Experiment	5
The Need for Diversity in American Day Care	11
Day Care in America	72
Part II - Programs for Children	
Overview of Development and Day Care	20
Social and Emotional Development of Young Children	103
Cognitive Development and Programs for Day Care	51
Language Development in Day Care Programs	13
Stimulation, Learning and Motivation Principles for Day Care Programs	145

Part III - Adult Involvement

Adult-Child Interaction and Personalized Day Care	85
Parent Involvement in Early Education	119
Parent-Training Programs and Community Involvement in Day Care	1

Part IV - Program Supports

Health Support in Day Care	57
Malnutrition and Early Development	127
Social Work and Supplementary Services	58
Staff Selection and Training	32
Delivery Systems	--

Part V - Evaluation of Day Care Centers 10

As to the significance of the research, that is another matter. Research is a very difficult undertaking, and researching complex problems with multiple variables and numerous inter-related levels is exceptionally difficult. Furthermore, translating research into policy for large-scale social action programs is, as Dr. Edward Zigler, the former director of the Office of Child Development and a highly-regarded researcher himself, has pointed out, not only difficult but treacherous. In his keynote address at the 1970 Annual Meeting of the Day Care and Child Development Council of America, he said:

> An alarming new development on the scene is the readiness of many investigators to make social action recommendations. There is nothing wrong with a good investigator clearly presenting his position and telling society which way it ought

to go, providing he is clear in saying that this is what he believes; but it is different to dress up social action recommendations around research findings from some particular studies on particular little bits of research and from that build some kind of social action program or suggested social action program.

Elsewhere in the same speech, he noted:

...I did not come here to denigrate research people. I am convinced, however, that our ability to help children cannot out-distance our knowledge of them. On the current scene, there are many theories, hypotheses, as well as blatant prejudices, but very little in the way of totally firmed-up information that will lead us unerringly along some social action path. We still have to use our own judgment and play our best hunches. We must therefore develop enough professional and personal integrity so that we are not unduly influenced by every passing thought that has the good fortune to be published.

One possible implication of what Dr. Zigler is saying is that despite his strictures the exact opposite may actually be taking place. Like Dr. Zigler, we are not denigrating research. We are interested here, rather, in the nature of the research and what can be learned from it about parent participation in Head Start. In this regard the following statements can be made without equivocation. Most of the research has been done by experts in the field of early childhood development, mainly it would seem by psychologists. While there is nothing inherently wrong with this, it has nevertheless tended to skew the nature of the work. Although the particular problems, the researchers have chosen to investigate are almost too various to enumerate or catalog, it is clear that their chief interest has been in the parent as learner or as teacher of his or her own children.

There has been virtually no investigation of the role of parents as decision-makers and what effects this may have had on their children. In fact the present study, which included field research as well as literature review, appears to be the first which has attempted the latter task, and as we have noted elsewhere, we are well aware of its limitations.

In this part of our report, we review the available literature on Head Start and other early childhood programs both to document the available knowledge and information on parent participation as well as to draw attention to the weight which has been given to the parent as learner as opposed to the parent as decision-maker.

a. Orientations

In Table I, the rationales for parent participation are divided into two main groups. The first two columns show those orientations which are aimed at overcoming the effects of deprivation by treatment of individuals who have been seen as deprived. This would consist of providing input to enable the person to reach a standard of health or educational achievement which has not been met because of the circumstances in his life. The second orientation recognizes the above, but focuses on the need to modify institutions or the social system in such a way that either standards or life circumstances change. The individual then is no longer "victimized" and is able to influence the system and achieve whatever new standards he conceives as being necessary.

TABLE I

Social Rationales for Parent Involvement

Source	Indiv. Treatment of Parent; as learner IA1a	Indiv. Treatment, Parent as Teacher of child IA1b	Parent has legal rights IA2	Parent Part. to change institutions (after training) IA3a	Parent Part. to change institutions IA3b	Participation for ethnic/ cultural relevance IA4
HS	Bennett, 1966 Roberts, 1966 HS Newsletter, 1968 Mouat, 1969 HS Policy "Parents" 1970 OCD report, 1970 Wille, 1970	Clarizio, 1968 HS Newsletter, 1968 Hervey, 1968 Juniper Gardens, 1968 Miller, 1968 Swift, 1968 Stern, Kitano, 1968, 1970 McCarthy, 1968 Boger, 1969 Gordon, 1969b Jacob, Pierce-Jones, 1969 HS Policy "Parents," 1970 Kowatrukal, 1970 Adkins, 1971 Childhood Resources, 1971 Fitzsimmons, 1971 Nimnicht, 1971 Ruopp, 1971	OCD report, 1970 HS Policy "Parents," 1970	Harm, HS Newsletters Gordon, 1969 Mouat, 1969 HS Policy "Parents," 1970 Nimnicht, 1970 Wille, 1970 MIDCO, 1971	Kirschner & Assoc., 1970	Ruopp, 1971a
Non HS	Chilman, 1966 Duff, 1971 Nedler & Sebera, 1971 Ruopp, 1971 a	Radin, Weikart, 1968, 1969 Costello, etal., 1969 Scheinfeld, 1969 SW Ed. Lab. 1969 Gordon, 1969 a,b,c, 1970,71 Levenstein, 1970, 1971 Karnes, 1970 Childhood Resources, 1971 Gray, 1971 Conant, 1971 Ortar, 1971 Weikart, 1971	AFRAM, 1971	Manning, 1971 delaGaza, 1971	FAP, 1971 AFRAM, 1971 Ruopp, 1971b	AFRAM, 1971 BCDI, 1971 Hess, 1971
General Literature		McDavid, 1969 Bronfenbrenner, 1970 Bronfenbrenner, 1970	West, 1967	West, 1967 Watkins, in Shapiro, 1967	Cohen, 1969 a, b Hess, etal., 1971	

As can be seen, much as in the Grotberg compenduim, the greatest amount of interest by far has been in the deprivation or individual deficit model.

Individual Treatment

(1) Parent as Learner

Head Start

A major social rationale is that for whatever set of reasons, Head Start parents require information, assistance and support in improving the quality of home life. This assumption is embodied in the official documents of Head Start. A report released by the Office of Child Development reports that in 1968, one-fifth of Head Start centers averaged one or more monthly contacts with parents for educational or vocational counseling. About 64% in full year and 31% in summer reported that adult educational programs were available in the community and were utilized. About 41% to 52% also reported the availability and utilization of work experience and training programs; 32%-49% of the full year centers and 19%-29% of the summer centers reported that community work in training programs, job retraining programs and employment agencies were available and utilized. This was based on a 5% sample of full year Head Starts and 1% sample of summer Head Starts in that year. (OCD, 1970, page 28)

The Head Start Newsletters in the same year(1968) published a series of articles devoted to parent participation. The September article was entitled "A Parent Participation Issue" and contained in an editorial by Bessie Draper the following

quotation: "Unless the home environment is changed, no lasting benefit can result. The initiative for changing the home environment must come from the parents...but the Head Start program must supply the incentive, the direction, and encouragement." (Head Start, 1968, page 1) In that same issue was a series of suggestions for parent participation by Draper, with the cardinal rule stated as: "Find out what parents want to know and/or do and when, then arrange to do it at times convenient for the majority of the parents." (ibid, page 3) The August Newsletter includes "A bill of rights and responsibilities for parents" which includes the notion of improving oneself as a parent.

Although these form an official picture as of 1968, the current statement of Head Start policy (1970) states a continuation of this view: "Head Start provides for the involvement of the child's parent and other members of the family by giving them many opportunities for a richer appreciation of the young child's needs and how to satisfy them..." Embedded in these documents is the view that parents need help in such areas as literacy training, managing budgets, awareness of nutrition, learning such skills as sewing, but that parents as learners must have a fundamental role in determining what it is they desire to learn. This respects the dignity and integrity of parents and indicates that even though parents are seen as learners, the Head Start materials assume that learners are also decision-makers in the sense that they have a right to select what it is they wish to learn.

When we turn to local studies that reflect the view of parent as learner, a Chicago study indicated that parent involvement was a major goal. (Mouat, 1969, Wille, 1970) Parents were invited to talk with center staff, were recruited door to door and were questioned about what it was they wanted. This project, using mobile classroom centers in Chicago's west side, developed programs which were teacher directed and structured, but based upon parent input. Parents were required to attend a half-day a week and not only had informal discussions of their problems but also access to a special unit with a washer, dryer, sewing machine, and playpens, staffed by a home economics teacher. Parents were seen as learners with needs for service and information.

Based upon the idea that one of the problems faced by many homes is a lack of books rather than a lack of interest in books, the Queensboro Public Library program developed a library approach of making materials and information available rather than providing direct instruction. (Bennett, 1966; Roberts, 1966) Pamphlets were distributed on relevant weekly topics for participants to keep, reading matter was suggested, films were used. Parents indicated that they preferred verbal presentation by library staff or outside experts, followed by questions from the audience. Examples of topics were: family budgets, credit, health, children's emotions, sibling rivalry, equal rights, music appreciation, home repairs and sewing.

These two programs, Chicago and Queens, reflect many local programs in which the materials may or may not relate to child rearing or teaching one's child, but are chosen by the parents to fulfill some information or skill need. One may assume that if a person manages the family budget, this will have an impact on the child, or if nutrition is improved this will certainly effect the child's health; but, the target is parent need as defined by parent rather than child need as defined by either expert or parent.

Non-Head Start

Chilman's (1966) review of poverty cites a number of possible solutions. Although the issue of cultural diversity is discussed, the conclusion is that the poverty culture or lower class culture works to the disadvantage of its members and should, therefore, be changed. Included among specific strategies for change are parent counseling, parent education and social services. (See earlier discussion, pages I 7-8)

Nedler and Sebera(1971) developed a program for working with Spanish-speaking children on the assumption that these children are at a disadvantage when they enter school. Here the ultimate target was clearly the child, but the intermediate gain was to influence the parent by raising the intellectual performance of the children through an indirect approach designed to effect the behavior of the parent. The program provided parental instruction through planned meetings of topical interest, i.e., story-telling techniques, nutrition, mental health, child care, hygiene, legal aid and the importance

of school attendance. All program personnel were bilingual. Their results did not lead them to support their indirect parent group meeting approach. They concluded: "To make the Parental Involvement Program more effective in aiding in the development of the educationally disadvantaged child, it will be necessary to orient the program to education of the parent in techniques of stimulating the intellectual and social development of their children." (ibid, page 266) They further indicated that the problem rests in language not total intellectual difficulty. They did not measure the parents, but drew their conclusions from measures of child performance.

As part of a general review for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare of child care practices, Ruopp (1971) reported on a number of day care programs. Most of these did not function on the basis of the concept of parent as learner; but he indicated that the Greeley Parent and Child Center involves parents in governance of program," serves as an educational facility during the evening for programs pertaining to child growth and development, consumer education, and a wide variety of other educational subjects of interest to the parents thus further involving the parents in their own educational program as well as their children's ...(AIMS College has participated in providing these educational programs. Under its guidelines when six or more community residents want a course, AIMS will find and fund someone to teach it)". (Ruopp, 1971a, page 11)

(2) Parent as Teacher

Head Start

The overwhelming number of reports of Head Start parent involvement emphasize the role of the parent as teacher. The Head Start Newsletters (1968) emphasize this role in its list of parent responsibilities. The new Head Start policy guidelines state: "H.E.W. requires that each grantee make home visits as part of its program when parents permit such visits ... Head Start staff should develop activities to be used at home by other family members that will reinforce and support the child's total Head Start experience...every effort must be made to explain the advantages of visits to parents." (Head Start, 1970, page 9)

In general, the rationale for programs rests on the following assumptions:

- Head Start parents lack certain skills which are useful in effecting the achievement of their children and their children reflect the lack of high parent expectations for them.
- The language style of the home does not provide the child with the type of language skills that are useful in school achievement.
- The homes are faced with numerous problems which because of poverty are difficult to solve and, therefore, children do not receive the care and attention parents may wish to provide.

What may be assumed is that programs which aim at teaching the mother or parent or other family members ways in which they can work effectively with their children indicate that parents are able, and wish to learn those types of information which have been found to be useful in providing children with the best basis for succeeding in schools as they are now constituted. The aim, then, is to provide to homes, as complementary to activities provided for children in centers, the kinds of materials, tools, attitudes, skills which have been found or which are assumed to relate to scholastic achievement, achievement motivation and high self-esteem.

As indicated throughout, the premises on which such programs are based are almost classic statements of the cultural deprivation thesis.

The programs listed below share the following views about Head Start parents:

- Mothers (parents) can be trained in either individual or group settings so that language patterns in the home will be influenced. (Swift, 1968, Adkins, 1971)

- Expectations for child success will be raised (Adkins, 1971, Gordon, 1969, Kowatrukal, 1970, McCarthy, 1968, Harvey, 1968, Jacobs, Pierce-Jones, 1969)

- Mothers can learn specific ways to teach a child. (Juniper Gardens, 1968, Miller, 1968, Stern and Kitano, 1968, Swift, 1968, Adkins, 1971, Gordon, 1969, Boger, 1969)

- Training should be designed so that parents increase their feelings of potency, over what happens to their children. (Gordon, 1969, Adkins, 1971, Stern and Kitano, 1968, Swift, 1968, Scheinfeld, 1969)

- Modeling in the center is an effective tool for influencing the behavior of parents, and therefore, attendance or participation at the center or school is a necessary ingredient. (Roupp, 1971, Juniper Gardens, 1968, Swift, 1968, Miller, 1968)

The studies reported above were located in a wide geographical area throughout the United States.

Non-Head Start

Of special interest here is the current position taken by some of the innovators. (Nimnicht, 1971, Weikart, 1971, Levenstein, 1971, Gordon, 1971) They all now indicate that teaching-learning is a two-way street; parents have many things to teach professionals and professionals, while they have many things to teach parents, have much to learn. There has been a movement in their programs not only toward parent involvement in the sense of Policy Advisory Committees, but in the individual face-to-face contact between teacher and parent. For example, Weikart states that there needs to be a shift of emphasis of the teacher's role to that of helping the mother recognize and state the goals she has for her child, and to help her develop the skills necessary for her to support the development of her child toward those goals. Nimnicht talks of the concept of the ability of parent or family to attend to a child and suggests that treatment should be to improve the parents' ability to attend by correcting the causes of poor

attendance. These causes may lie in the income, housing, health or other domain and may only be partly treated by helping a parent master teaching skills. Gordon and Garber in their Head Start Planned Variation Program stress that the parent educator is to actively solicit ideas, suggestions, information from the parent about activities both for herself as well as for the child. Levenstein (1971) indicates that the parents in her program informally contribute ideas and information to the teachers rather than through organized group channels.

These programs, despite a slight shift in emphasis, still see a main focus of parent involvement to be parent education in child rearing and teaching roles. As Gray (1971) indicates, the DARCEE program not only attempts this but spills over in terms of helping parents plan to organize life, budget income, provide more nutritive meals and overcome the feeling of powerlessness over themselves. Gordon's preschool programs have emphasized providing parents with ideas for engaging their children in playful learning activities, with the notion that, as parents see they are having an effect on the child's learning, this will increase the parents' sense of powerfulness and self-esteem, which may in turn lead to their exercising these feelings in other domains such as jobs and housing.

Chilman (1968) pointed out that many of the intervention programs were created by developmental psychologists, concerned with parenting and not the parent. However, there

is recognition that the family is a transactional institution in which all members influence each other. McDavid's review of intervention work led him to conclude that "there is mounting evidence that the relative degree of success of various kinds of programs, especially with respect to the durability of their impact on the child over an extended period of time, is dependent upon the factor of home involvement, and modification of the developmental milieu of the child through intervention in the home." (McDavid, 1969, page 32) Bronfenbrenner best states the case: "Any appreciable enduring improvement in the child's development can be effected only through an appreciable enduring change in the behavior of the persons intimately associated with the child on a day-to-day basis." (Bronfenbrenner, 1970, page 58)

Summary

Parent participation in the learner role has been treated in two fashions:

1. Parents as learner with the program being influenced by parents' desires, and with the curriculum not necessarily related to the education or child rearing of the child.

2. Parents as teacher, or to put it another way, as learner of skills, attitudes, techniques, so that they can enhance the direct influence which the family already has on the child, in ways that are assumed to relate to school and work success.

Although rooted in change, the programs emphasize changes that should take place in parents themselves, particularly mothers, so they can influence both themselves

and their children. While some investigators feel that these individual changes may spill over and effect other areas, housing, for example, or employment, these are viewed largely as secondary effects.

Social Change

The second major rationale for parent involvement moves past the parent as an individual and past the concept that change should come about solely within the family. The emphasis here is on legal rights of parents; the responsibilities, and contributions that parents can make not only in influencing the growth of their own children but also in their participation as it effects the growth of all children. As we shall see, there are very few studies or even anecdotal material to report in this area. While policy statements from both within as well as outside of Head Start have stressed the importance of this rationale, the available data points to one of two conclusions. The social change focus is (a) mainly rhetorical; that is, it is stressed verbally but not acted out in practice; or (b) investigators have not viewed it as of sufficient importance to report on or study.

(1) A Matter of Rights

Head Start

As noted elsewhere in this report, there were three crucial shifts in Head Start policy with regard to parent participation. In its initial stages, emphasis fell on the parent as learner. Later a decision-making role within the

Head Start program was articulated. Still later, these first two roles were maintained, but there was a suggestion, at least of a shift to a community action or social change focus. From the "rights" point of view, the 1970 Policy Statement is abundantly clear. It not only changed the name of the Policy Advisory Committee to Policy Counsil it also stated that, "every Head Start program must have effective parent participation." It then goes on to spell out the formal structure of the Policy Committee and some of the functions it might perform. As the Manual notes, these are minimum functions; if a Policy Council is able to negotiate additional functions, this is permitted. The listed functions include approval or disapproval of:

- Goals
- Location of centers
- Plans to use available community resources
- Plans for recruitment of children
- The composition of the policy group and the method for setting it up (within HEW guidelines)
- What services should be provided to Head Start from the Delegate Agency
- Head Start personnel policies
- Hiring and firing Head Start's Director of Delegate Agency and staff
- Requests for funds and proposed work programs
- Major changes in the budget
- Information needed for pre-review to Policy Council

In addition, there are two "must be consulted" items:

- Identifying child development needs in the area to be served
- Ensuring that standards for acquiring space, equipment, and supplies are met

Although withholding or granting of approval is a powerful role, it may be exercised without the involvement of a considerable number of parents and may become a paper act. Furthermore, it is important for evaluation in this area to know the extent to which parents actually fulfill or are permitted to fulfill the functions assigned in the Policy Manual. A second major consideration is the extent to which parents are aware of the Policy Manual and of the functions in it. On all of these scores, data are non-existent.

Non-Head Start

AFRAM Associates, an organization formed in 1969 to promote parent involvement, has developed a series of what are called "action stimulators." Action Stimulator #34--parents as teachers--refers to a list of parent rights in respect to school. Although this list was prepared in reference to the New York City school system, it is applicable to the rationale concerning parents' legal rights.

The major ideas are that:

- All parents have a non-negotiable right to advocate on behalf of the rights of their children...parental participation in the educational process is a necessity not just a supplement to that which occurs within the school.

- Parents know how to perform teaching activities, and the "teacher behaviors" list simply serves to remind them of what they are or should be doing.

In general, the list seems to go beyond the notion, vital to Head Start, that parents and professionals work <u>together</u> in a partnership arrangement to develop and carry out programs and represents a stronger position on parent control than is being advocated by Head Start.

West (1967) indicates that parent involvement is a matter of democratic right. The home is seen as a valuable resource to the school: a source of goals and insights that usual methods do not reach. He states that parents should have a role in setting additional goals and objectives, be much more deeply involved in assisting the learning process and be directly involved in evaluation the outcome of education.

(2) Institutional Change

<u>Head Start</u>

The AFRAM document suggests that parents already know that they need to know, and that what is now required are the vehicles for enabling parents to exercise their power. AFRAM is strongly committed to the role of parent as decision-maker and changer of institutions. The Head Start position (Newsletters of 1968), the Head Start Policy Statement of 1970, as well as the MIDCO orientation kit (1971), would suggest that parent participation in decision-making is a process of learning for all members of

the policy group, parents and professionals alike. Decision-making is not taken from professionals and given to parents but is a shared responsibility.

The articles by Harm (1968) in the Head Start Newsletters on "How to Encourage and Use Parents on Advisory Bodies" takes the position that Head Start staff and community leaders can learn from parents and that members need orientation and training as well as experience. PAC meetings need to be arranged for the convenience of parents and solid guidelines need to be developed around decision making. "The group should be given a clear understanding of the kinds of situations in which the decisions of the Policy Advisory Council are final, those in which there must be consensus between the PAC and administering organization, and those in which the PAC's views are purely advisory." (Harm, 1968, page 2) The latest Policy Manual from OCD does just that.

The Florida Head Start Planned Variation program combines the activities of parent as teacher of child with parent as decision-maker. This program stresses the vital role of the Policy Council in participating in all phases of the program but also adopts the view that the development of a strong Policy Council is a learning process rather than an instant change. The Policy Council is seen as a partnership arrangement of shared decision making rather than a movement to complete parent control.

Wille (1970) and Moffat (1969) in discussing the Chicago mobile classroom center, indicate that the parent advisory group meets twice a month and serves as a vital organization in the development of parent program, in setting up an emergency parent borrowing fund, and in learning a variety of parent activities. This is the normal use of such councils.

Nimnicht's Planned Variation program (1970) encourages parent participation in administrative decision-making as well as in the classroom. His program now includes a training program to help improve parent effectiveness in decision making. He indicates that representative groups of parents must approve the program before it is introduced into the community, and that parents have a right to review the decision after observing it in action. The same caveat holds for the Florida Planned Variation program.

In recognition that many groups stepping into new roles needs training and orientation, MIDCO prepared an orientation kit for the parent section of the Head Start Manual (1971). The kit is a training program to be used by local groups in the clarification of the policy manual. The kit stresses that parents should participate so that their children see them as potent. The kit, together with the policy manual, perform the task that Harm set out in the 1968 Newsletter, by providing parents with orientation

and information about the program and about the rules of the game.

Non-Head Start

Manning's project in New York City (1971) was developed by the Center for Urban Education to "improve the scope and quality of citizen involvement in urban educational decision making practices. The underlying philosophy of this program is based on the belief that parents can and should take a more active role in their child's education, both at home and in relation to the school. The Parent Participation Workshop Program is unique in several respects:

1. It provides parents with specific knowledge.
2. Seeks to expand the concept of education.
3. Defines the role of the home and the parent in educative process.

By training parents to train other parents, the Parent Participation Workshop Program not only produces a core of potential leaders but increases the likelihood that the program will be responsive to the need of the participants. This program (not yet available for dissemination) was aimed at low income Black and Puerto Rican parents of inner-city children in the New York City public schools. It is not clear from the description available that it will go further than the MIDCO kit in getting into the problems of group process which confront a parent seeking to participate.

In a panel program chaired by Shapiro (1967), Watkins stated that faculty, local school personnel and neighborhood residents should form planning boards empowered to select school personnel, and to propose and implement innovations. He said that low income communities can explain the demographic characteristics of poverty areas to teacher trainees, involve them in area activities and offer them direct personal experiences. He urged that school systems guarantee parent/community involvement in decision-making before teachers are placed in schools. To some degree, this concept has been implemented in new approaches to teacher education and particularly in the Teacher Corps program sponsored jointly by the University of Florida and Duval County schools. Despite all these efforts the issue still remains: How are ultimate decisions arrived at and where does power really lie?

Ruopp (1971), describing the Greeley Day Care Center, states that the significance of parent control at Greeley is great. Most of the parents indicated that they have never before been involved in an organization in which they themselves can hold key positions. They have formed their own corporation and are in a position to make decisions about what happens to their children and to themselves. The sense of ownership from actually constituting the governing board, being involved in the negotiation for mortgages and the purchase of the property on a mortgaged basis,

and the control of hiring and other policy issues have reportedly had a large impact on the parents. The parent child center is under the governance of the Colorado Migrant Council which itself has established a pattern of local community involvement. The Advisory Board is described as representing more parent control than that embodied in the Head Start guidelines, and indicates that rather than confrontation the program is actually a partnership arrangement of parents and staff.

In a position paper Cohen (1969) indicates that he does not accept the cultural deprivation theory for failure to learn and feels that low income children suffer in the school because the curriculum is irrelevant and the pedagogy ineffective. He takes the position that local control of schools can make a difference in school achievement because it can lead to more relevant curriculum and more effective instruction without necessarily coming to grips with all of the other social issues.

(3) Ethnic/Cultural Relevance

Head Start

The Head Start program has been concerned with the fact that in our society a disproportionate number of members of ethnic minorities fall into the poverty category. Since Head Start was intended to reach these populations, a natural outcome has been the desire to involve parents in programs, as a means of insuring that their ethnicity is

respected and that their children will be able to develop a strong sense of dignity and pride in their ethnic heritage. Ruopp (1971, page 13) described one program that defined itself as "a small UN." Parents felt that a major outcome of parent involvement was the respect gained for and the loss of fear of people from other races. Center activities "provide direct learning about other races and cultures that dispels old prejudices." AFRAM (1970, page 2) lists as a teaching behavior possessed by parents "teach my child about white institutional racism and its consequences...teach my child to respect himself."

A position paper prepared by the Black Child Development Institute on optimum conditions for minority involvement in quality child development programming states: "Where children of minority group extraction are involved, there must be provision for curriculum components which address the unique features of the relevant ethnic and/or history, culture and community life styles, as defined by the specific ethnic or racial groups involved in individual projects." (BCDI, 1971, page 19) Under no circumstances should parents be required directly or indirectly to relinquish control over their children to institutions. Parent participation in the making of policy is non-negotiable and parents should make up no less than 51% of the policy making board. The training of parents so that they perform the policy making function should be

considered an item for which Federal funds can be requested.

Hess (1971) discussed this issue in detail and describes without identifying them, programs developed by Black and Chicano groups in which parents are on governing boards and work in the schools as teachers. In one instance, the aim of the school was to develop a strong ethnic identity in the children.

Summary

If there is a significant hole in the Head Start research and evaluation literature it is in the area of the social change rational. The only large scale study that had hard data was the Kirschner report (1970) prepared for the Office of Child Development. The writers studied the relationship of parent participation of Head Start centers to Head Start's role in the institution. Through questionnaires, they differentiated those centers labelled high parent participation from those which were low participation centers. They concluded "there does seem to be a relatiohship between the degree of parental participation in Head Start center and the extent of the center's involvement in the institutional change process." (page 119) They further pointed out: "high parent participation centers served as authorizers and executors of change significantly more often than low parent participaiton centers...not only did its degree of parent participation make a difference in

the Head Start Center's level of involvement in change, but also in the quality of involvement or the function it performed within the change process...High participation centers were more often mentioned as serving through organizational means to create a background conducive to change (in 50% of the cases compared with only 12% for the lows). The researchers indicated that the most effective method used by Head Start to influence change was overwhelmingly by direct action followed by, in the case of high parent participation, influence on private persons and groups, then influence on other organizations. (page 224) It should be noted that this study is concerned with how involvement in Head Start influenced change in agencies other than Head Start i.e. medical, social services, and other community activities.

There is no study of how parent participation in decision making in Head Start changed Head Start programs or the ways in which parents played their decision making role in the establishment of Head Start programs. Lacking is solid case material showing the development of the program over the course of the years in which the program's biography was written, and thus the insights into the change process. Needed therefore is not a rationale, but the means for measuring the application of the rationale.

Unstated, but a reality in the operation of Policy Councils, is the need for skill training in the organization and conduct of meetings. Too formal presentation, i.e.,

Robert's Rules of Order, keeping of minutes, boundaries on discussion, can all prove stumbling blocks to the involvement of parents in decision making. Professionals may often dominate meetings because they know these skills and have formed a "hidden curriculum" for them. Nowhere in the documents from which this rationale is extracted, is this issue discussed.

In summary the role of parents as decision makers and in affecting social change has been proclaimed widely both within and without the Head Start program. Proclamations, however, do not necessarily mean fulfillment of function. Only one study (Kirschner, 1970) evaluated the role of parents as decision makers; the other references deal with program descriptions or recommendations. If we are serious about parents as decision makers, then this must be evaluated far more carefully than it has been and must become a basic part of any long range Head Start or Head Start related implementation and evaluation effort.

Chapter 2

The Engineering Framework: Psycho-Educational Intervention

Introduction

Most of the intervention strategies used in Head Start or Head Start type programs can best be described as psycho-educational in nature. These strategies usually rest on one or the other if the rationales discribed in the previous chapter and thus provide an engineering framework as to how the program is to implement the social aim. As will become evident once again, the foal of the various programs is largely to change individuals or families rather than the larger social context that effects their lives.

Table II presents differing viewpoints on psycho-educational rationales and program descriptions for parent involvement programs as follows:

- Programs which have either a stated or implicit assumption that the reason for parent involvement and parent education is based on some hope for a gain in children by providing parents with teaching skills.
- Explicit utilization of an operant theory of learning.
- Explicit use of psychoanalytic or affective theory.
- Programs which combine both treatment and decision making foci.
- Programs aimed directly at parents' needs, and only indirectly at how meeting these might influence the parent-child relationship or child development.
- Programs dealing only with parent participation.

Among the techniques used by the programs are behavior modification, efforts to build ego so the parent experiences himself as powerful; simple access to materials which will help improve life-style; the need to change environment; and the role of general parent participation as beneficial to children. Both group and home visit programs are described in terms of methods and results.

a. Group meetings

Head-Start

An examination of the thesis that parents should be learners either for themselves of for their children, yields seven concepts concerning implementation. The first of these deals with parents needing specific training to improve or change home teaching patterns. The following programs utilized parent group meetings.

Stern, Kitano et al (1968) established four treatment groups. In the first the teacher gave materials to the parents for use at home while she used the same materials in her classroom. The second was classroom only. The third was for home use only, and a fourth was a control group. The investigators studied whether parents provided with such materials and techniques would become more effective teachers of their own children, and if seeing themselves as effective would feel less alientated and powerless in relation to the larger community. The materials used were developed at UCLA and consisted of picture story books and

program booklets to teach color, shape and size.

A program was conducted from 1967-1970 at the University of Hawaii (Adkins, 1971). Various models of parent meetings were used, beginning with training parents to help supervise classroom activities then shifting to teaching parents to work with their own children. Staff teams met with parents using role playing and concrete reinforcers (refreshments, certificates). In 1968-1969, there were informal group discussions and the use of the Hawaiian language for preschool program. Classes focused on general child development. In 1969-1970, home interviews were used. A continuing problem was attendance even with the use of concrete reinforcers. The group meeting approach did not seem to be as effective as the home interview approach, and the informal efforts seemed more acceptable than formal ones. The major orientation seemed to be around language development and motivation.

Boger (1969) worked with 72 rural white disadvantaged and advantaged children and established three groups: one on developmental language, the second on structured language and the third a placebo workshop. Mothers met in 12 weekly two hour instructional sessions. The effort was to improve the quality of mother/child interaction and mother story telling ability.

Swift's (1968) approach was basically concerned with language. The rationale was that the lower class mother

needs specific activities designed to increase her confidence and her ability to effect growth and learning of her child. Parents attended sessions with their children, and an attempt was made to involve them in reading and story telling and to increase the quantity and quality of the mothers' verbalizations and encouragement to their children to varbalize.

All four of these group approaches used a professional teacher and focused heavily on language, using specific materials that had been teacher or university developed.

Non-Head Start

Programs of parent education based upon the rationales described in Table I are not unique to the United States. Ortar (1971) used a group situation to attempt to influence the verbal behavior or lower class mothers in Israel. One group was taught collectively for a short period of time about the importance of mother-verbal behavior, were coached on the production of "good sentences" and were given booklets and pamphlets. A second group was given this training followed by a single home visit from the field worker who demonstrated the techniques with the child. A follow up study a year later indicated that half the mothers remembered the principles and that those who had received the home visit were superior to those who had been exposed only to the group situation. What is unusual about this study is the small amount of training time

involved, and the follow up a year later. One implication from Ortar might be that it is not that some mothers lack skill but may lack awareness of skill.

The work done at various places throughout the United States would certainly support the idea of tremendous diversity among what naively might be considered a homogenious population. There are within the so-called disadvantaged group many mothers whose attitudes and behaviors are no different from so-called advantaged mothers (and vice versa), and many mothers who need minimal input and encouragement simply to see that their role of parent as teacher is important. A fundamental research design or an evaluation tool needs to be the utilization of subject x treatment rather than the gross notion of experimental group versus control.

b. Home Visits

Head Start

The DARCEE program begun in 1965 has been reported in a variety of places. Of interest here was that a group considered maximum impact involved both mother and child. The mother came to school and trained one day a week, and was also visited at home by a teacher. The child attended the center five days a week. A second group had only the child participation. The third group had only home visitation. The fourth was control. The DARCEE effort has probably been the longest programmatic effort for nursery

aged children with one of the largest sized populations. In the early stages only professionals were used as home visitors; currently para-professionals are being used.

The Head Start supported research was a nursery school program with the rationale that as the mother learned ways to improve her competence with her children and as a homemaker, this would lead to changes in her life style as well as in her relationships with her children, and would be reflected in the ability of other members of the family (Miller, 1969).

McCarthy (1969) had a program for four year olds in Terre Haute, Indiana in which a group with no parental involvement was compared to a group in which parents participated in general meetings. A third group used home visiting. The effort was to change parent attitudes and improve the language and intellectual functioning of children.

She found that parents were concerned and were willing to cooperate with school personnel. (A detailed description of the program is not available at this time)

Gordon (1969) and Gordon and Garber (1971), utilized the home visiting techniques which had been developed in preschool and Follow Through studies as one of the Head Start Planned Variation Models in four communities. The home visitor is a paraprofessional who spends half her time working in the center and half visiting homes on a regular

once a week schedule carrying out materials which have been designed locally to complement and supplement the center's work. The basic theoretical position behind the home visit materials was initially Piagetian. As the program has evolved, more and more effort was made to involve the parents themselves, in stating the types of materials they wish, and encouraging them to make suggestions for specific activities. Emphasis is shifting in this program from the design of the curriculum to more concern with the process of instruction. A list of desireable teaching behaviors emphasizing inquiry, language and thought, as well as the considered use of praise have been developed.

All these attempts convey one common idea to parents, that is, that parents are legitimate teachers of their children, and that parents can be effective in those areas which relate to academic achievement. This represents a fundamental shift from the view that parents are "only" child bearers or child rearers and that child rearing is separate from education. The concept of home visiting is easily generalizable, and these studies, combined with the ones which follow, provide a firm basis for decision making on the part of communities wishing to develop such efforts.

Non-Head Start

Gordon and his associates (1967, 1969a,b,c, 1971, 1972) in a series of studies commencing in 1966 with families of three month old infants developed a program utilizing

paraprofessionals as home visitors on a once a week basis. The program consists of:

- o Home visits only for children up to age two
- o Combination of home visits and small home learning center activities for two to three year olds.
- o Combination nursery-day care and home visit program for threes to school age.

In all of these, a central concept has been that the paraprofessional can become a skilled decision-maker determining together with the mother, what particular activities from a set of activities are applicable at the moment. The effort it to keep the materials in a "play or game" framework, to make them culturally relevant by involving the parent educators in the design and testing of materials, and by eliciting from the parents their reactions and suggestions. There were no comprehensive services in the research programs and only in the latest infant project (Gordon and Jester, 1972) were medical examinations and medical services available. A common delivery system with considerable flexibility for community and individual modification rather than a common program for all, appeared to be useful. Assuming that parents need specific training, the selection of trainer, training materials, and training processess must be related to the individual and cultural characteristics of the parents.

Levenstein's approach (1970) utilized a professional worker as home visitor who brought toys or books into the

home and played with the child in such fashion that she acted as a model for the mother of low income preschoolers. Levenstein's goals were primarily verbal interaction, utilizing the toys and books as devices for stimulating such interaction.

The kindergarten program (Radin, 1969) utilized bi-weekly home visits by a counselor in which the counselor planned activities to enable the mother to see herself as a resource person. As in the case of the Florida program, the emphasis is on materials in the home rather than the introduction of packaged materials.

Conant (1971) utilizing some of the ideas developed in earlier projects, sent paraprofessional tutors out to work with mothers of infants to increase the amount of involvement of mothers and to influence their feelings. The tutors received intensive training in child developement, patterns of child rearing, teaching parents to teach, and the activities and materials that enhance cognitive development as well as some reinforcement techniques and information about agencies in the community. Essentially the same preservice procedures can be found in the DARCEE, Ypsilanti and Florida efforts.

Summary

Several ideas emerge as critical variables from the group and home visit studies.

- The home visit programs are more successful than

the group programs alone, although some home visits also combined group activities about what to do. The mixture of techniques and especially their adaptation to fit local and individual situations, seem far more important than commitment to a doctrine.

- Although these programs were psychological in conception, they are sensitive to social, cultural, and economic factors.

- The materials and style of delivery, although they are within each program's overall rules or guidelines, are modified at the point of delivery to take into account the wishes, desires, attitudes, skills and home situation of the particular parent.

- More and more attention is being paid to involve the parent as learner in the process of input into the program either formally or informally, so that the individual and cultural meanings are considered. This type of built-in feedback means that the activities should become increasingly relevant to the real situations facing the learner.

- These programs explode the myth that low income mothers, even if working, are not concerned about the education and success of their children and will not find the time to engage in a teaching relationship with them. The life situation of many of these families are extremely precarious, and all of the people using home visitor approaches are impressed with the enthusiasm and effort that many parents put out to maintain their participation in these programs.

c. Contingency Management

There are several programs which have fundamental commitments to behavior modification. The DARCEE program, for example, teaches mothers behavior modification skills. The Juniper Gardens program, (1968) under the direction of the University of Kansas, directed its training to management techniques. The mothers were coached to praise

correct answers, and maintain orderly play using the principles of positive reinforcement. Adkins (1971) attempted to use concrete reinforcers to maintain parent involvement. It is not clear that parents were taught to utilize tokens, but the attempt to manage the quantity of parent participation by the use of such reinforcers did not seem to be effective.

The Texas study (Mandel, 1968) used a different approach to contingency management. Children were involved in a program in which they took home material rewards for performance, and the parents were informed that these rewards were for child performance in school each day. The effort was to see whether parents' attitudes towards their children's ability could be influenced by such a technique, The mothers' attitudes did not change, but interestingly enough, the teachers' attitudes did. It may be that the teachers became more sensitive to child performance, but the cues provided to the mothers were too gross for generalization.

Karnes (1970) studied a small group of parents and their young children 13-27 months who were involved in a fifteen month program. The mothers attended a two hour meeting weekly, and learned techniques based on the principles of positive reinforcement. They were asked to use these techniques with their children every day, and were given educational toys and materials appropriate for

the teaching model. Parents were paid to attend the meetings and transportation was provided. Using this mixed bag of approaches, it was found that not only did the children seem to gain, but also that the parents increased their community involvement.

Summary

Most of the researchers did not use contingency management exclusively or in its purest form. Principles of positive reinforcement cannot stand alone, but provide one of a number of tools which should be in the repertoire of the program staff. All would tend to agree that non-punitive management procedures are in the long run more to be desired than punitive techniques.

d. Affective Help

The concepts that lower class families are pathological is not accepted by the programs that have been described. Because of life's circumstances, parents have feelings and emotions about society, about themselves, or about their children that get in the way of effective performance in the role of parent as teacher. Stern and other (1970) used group process techniques at meetings in which parents and teachers were encouraged to express their feelings, frustrations, needs and expectations. The hypothesis was that parents participating in such

encounters would develop or show more direct concern for their children's education and develop more favorable attitudes towards Head Start, and that this would be reflected in the intellectual performance of children. The group experience did not seem to effect attitudes but did seem to have an impact on child performance.

Clarizio (1968) used small group meetings conducted by a trained social worker and home visits utilizing a counseling relationship. Primary emphasis was on the parent/child/school relationship. The assumption was that such social work activity in both group and individual settings would influence the attitude of the parent toward teachers, school authorities, preschool activities, and towards the parent's view of how their children were being treated by school personnel. He did not find that this program led to measured changes, and suggested that the program was too formal.

As an example of relating program to parents' characteristics, Costello et al (1969) used a social case work approach to those families in the Institute for Juvenile Reasearch preschool project whose children were the least competent and whose own behavior indicated that a group approach was not feasible. The social worker visited these homes, working with the mother in a nurturing, non-demanding, non-judgemental approach.

e. Perception as Powerful

MIDCO's conceptualization of why parents should be involved in helping the child at home, making decisions about the program, participating in the classroom, or engaged generally in parent activities, is that "the child needs to know that the whole family is involved and interested in his Head Start experience...the child needs to see his parents coming into his world of Head Start--showing interest and taking part...the child takes pride in his own parents...the child needs to see his parents learning and discovering new things and ideas and trying to improve his streets, schools, housing, etc. As he sees parents doing these things, he will be learning a concerned way of life in which one can join with others to work...and the child sees parents concerned and responsible about the child's world" (MIDCO, 1971, page 4). The Head Start Newsletters of 1968 indicate a similar rationale.

The Florida PE Planned Variation program (Gordon and associates, 1971) attempts to implement this in two ways:

- In each weekly home visit, the parent is actively solicited for ideas, suggestions about what should be going on in home learning tasks, is actively encouraged to visit the school, work in the school, and become involved in various center and PC committees.

- The organization of Planned Variation mini-PAC's which exercise the roles depicted in the Federal guidelines and systematically feed into the auditing process of the home learning tasks, and the initial development process of these tasks.

The suggestions which emerge from the Family Assistance Program Evaluation Conference (1971) indicate also that for psychological as well as social reasons, parents functioning as decision-makers have an impact on their children. AFRAM in its guides echoes the same view. The assumption is that when parents can behave and be seen by their children as behaving in ways which influence the life of the child outside the home, as well as in the home, affective development, achievement motivation, self-esteem and pride will be enhanced. Since there are close ties between these affective variables and cognitive functioning, the increased self-esteem and desire to achieve will yield academic results.

f. Access to Materials and Information

There is a wide range within the parent population as to what needs really are. While programs in Columns A, B, and C of Table II assume that parents need a good deal of specific help, programs in Column E are more general. The concept here is that access to information is the essential ingredient. The Queens program (Roberts, Bennett, 1966) provided access to library information and resources. The

Ruopp studies (1971 a,b) of the day care centers in Greeley and Salt Lake City, and the Chicago program (Wille, 1970) indicate a similar view.

Head Start in its Newsletters and directives states that this is a basic position. It is embodied in their view of parent as learner, in which the parent selects what it is he chooses to learn. A number of programs have attempted to find locations in schools, community action centers or neighborhood centers, where parents can congregate at any time of the day, and to equip them with sewing machines, television sets, coffee bars, etc. The implications behind the location might be two-fold:

- If these programs are set up on school sites, a major function served would be to communicate to parents that the building does indeed belong to them, that they are welcome, that is a community resource, and that the wall between home and school can be breached.

- If the program is set up at a center, the implication might simply be that parents need a place where they can meet informally, exchange ideas, get work done and learn skills that are personally satisfying and/or economically worthwhile.

The message here is that if information is made available, parents have the desire and adequacy to implement the information gained in their own fashion, in keeping with their own culture, and can modify home conditions in ways that are perceived to benefit children

When we turn to a non-Head Start program (Nedler and Sebera, 1971) the emphasis is on more than simple access.

The provision of information is through instruction and planned meetings, although these meetings are on topics of interest of parents. This procedure is found often in Head Start programs in which the program descripters are:

- o Parents indicate what they might like.
- o Professionals present the content requested in group situations.

This is in contrast to the creation of an environment, i.e. parent meeting rooms. Generally, parent involvement programs should provide both alternatives. The decision as to which mix to choose or which element to favor should be left to the discretion of the parents.

g. Change in Life Circumstances

Nimnicht (1971) in an unpublished wide-ranging paper, develops a set of propositions about the nature and causes of deprivation. He suggests that for children growing up in environments which lack the basic requirements of food, shelter and health,"the treatment seems obvious. The first priority should be to provide adequate care of an expectant mother and adequate food, shelter, health care for the child. This approach certainly will be of more educational value than trying to correct a physical problem with educational intervention." (ibid, page III-a) For those who are deprived by what he called lack of the ability of the parent or family to attend to a child, he recommends that treatment should create opportunity for a change in life circumstances. For example, "if the mother is the only

adult in the home, either enable her to stay home or provide adequate care for her children while she works." (Ibid)

It is important to point out that the Nimnicht proposal involves change in the environment, and thus specifically moves in the direction of social structural change. While many child development specialists would no doubt agree with his view, it is perhaps significant that few of them have ventured as far as Nimnicht in articulating it. By and large they have viewed their role or intervening in parent/child (and mainly mother/child) relationships, and not in the larger social sphere.

n. General Parent Participation

There are many forms of parent participation that are simply defined as "parent activities of high participation" which have been used in studies of Head Start with no criteria indicated. There seems to be a view that parent participation is a "good thing" and will somehow magically rub off on children. Examples of attempts to build programs on the basis of this broad approach, or evaluate such programs are listed in Column G on Table II.

Bittner (1968) described a school readiness center program in which the performance of children who had been in either summer Head Start, or were low or middle income with no preschool training, were compared on the Metropolitan Achievement tests. Some form of parent involvement existed, because she reported that the child whose parents did not

TABLE II

Psycho-educational Rationales and Program Descriptions for Parent Involvement Programs

Source	A Parents need specific training to improve in or change home teaching patterns	B Contingency management is what parents need	C Parents need some form of affective help	D Parents need to be seen by their children as powerful, therefore create exercise of power	E Parents need access to materials, equipment, general info on children, family life, law, diet	F A change in life circumstances will allow parents to improve their functioning	G General parent "participation" will enhance child
Head Start	Groups Stern & Kitano, 1968 Swift, 1968 Boger, 1969 Adkins, 1971 Stern & Kitano, 1970 Home Visits Miller, J., 1968 McCarthy, 1968 Gordon, 1969c	Miller, J., 1968 Mandel, 1968 Juniper Gardens, 1968 Adkins, 1971	Clarizio, 1968 Kowatruka, 1970 Stern, 1970	HS Newsletter, 1968 Gordon, 1969d MIDCO, 1971	Bennett, 1966 Roberts, 1966 Wille, 1970 Ruopp, 1971a	Nimnicht, 1971	Hervey, 1968 Bittner, 1968 Leler, 1968 Jacobs, Pierce-Jones, 1969
Non Head Start	Groups Ortar, 1971 Home Visits Gordon, 1967, etc Weikart, Radin, 1968, 1969 Scheinfeld, 1969 Levenstein, 1970 Conant, 1971	Karnes, 1970	Costello et al, 1969	FAP, 1971 AFRAM, 1971	Nedler & Sebera, 1971		

participate in the programs performed more poorly on the tests. Leler (1968) as cited by Grotberg (1969) indicated that children of high participating mothers did significantly better on tests of achievement and development than low participating mothers.

Harvey found that parent participation in Head Start did not modify the attitudes and behavior of parents in ways that might be assumed to influence the children. She assessed the difference between Head Start and non-Head Start parents on education and child rearing practices. Not only did she find few differences, but she reported that there was no evidence that Head Start experience changed the parent.

In a study of parents of children in a Texas six-month Head Start program, interviews were used to test the assumption that active parent participation in the program would increase parental scores on levels of general optimism and aspiration for the child. Neither of these were confirmed. (Jacobs, Pierce-Jones , 1969) The data are not surprising. The conclusions arrived at earlier concerning the need for organized approaches would suggest that mere undefined participation, unmatched to parent entering characteristcs, would have little effect on parent views. There was, however, some indication that the children of parents who were high participants did better. One non-Head Start study, of migrant children, found

similar results. The quality of participation is not defined in either of these studies and there is no indication of self-selectivity.

It should be recalled that earlier Head Start studies indicated that children of parents who chose Head Start did better than those who were recruited into Head Start (McDavid, 1969). Unless there is some base line, there should be little expectation that participation will be a useful general criteria for success of a program if we are concerned about the program itself affecting parents and children.

Summary

Although it is dangerous to generalize from so disparate a range of studies, the following directions would seem to emerge from the material.

- Parent involvement should consist of a variety of approaches, and be designed in such fashion that it becomes possible for parents to participate in the mix in ways best suited to their needs.
- Program evaluation should move in the direction of treatment by subject so that it can be learned which particular mix or program elements are most useful in relation to specific parent characteristics.
- Educational intervention is not helpful if the physical environment of the family lacks the basic requirements for living.
- While there is a general sense that "parent participation" is a good thing, undefined participation, unmatched to parent characteristics appear to have little effect on parent views.

Chapter 3

Evaluation of Parent Participation Programs

Introduction

This chapter is concerned with the instruments used and results obtained in assessing the effects on parents of participation programs. Head Start programs are presented in Table III and non-Head Start programs in Table IV.

There is a striking drop in the number of entries on these tables compared to Tables I and II. Virtually all of the evaluations related to programs which appear in columns A, B, and C, or in the catchall column in Table II appear in the Individual Treatment columns in Table I. The gap in evaluation of the effect on parents, the evaluation and assessment of either process measures for assessing actual parent participation in decision-making, or product measures of the effects on either parent or Head Start programs of parental involvement in decision making is striking.

Anyone who has been involved in Head Start knows full well that there has been participation of parents in such roles as volunteers in classrooms, as well as in activities related to the PAC,* fostered by the PAC and in the PAC itself. What is missing are documented materials; either descriptive statistics of the extent of involvement or measures of the effects. Involvement is built into Head Start, but it has not been assessed.

*PAC-Policy Advisory Committee - the Head Start term for parent groups until 1970.

TABLE IV

Evaluation of Non HS Parent Participation Programs
Assessment Procedure

Program Focus	A Pre-Post Cog/Lang	B Testing Affective	C Unobstrusive Census Data	D Interview, Questionnaire	E Observation of Behavior
Parent as Learner				Gordon, 1971	
Parent as Teacher of own children	Levenstein, 1970	Gordon, 1969 b	Karnes, 1970	Radin & Sonquist, Garber & Tocco, 1969 Radin, 1969 Scheinfeld, 1969 Conant, 1971 Gordon, 1971 Ortar, 1971 Tuck, 1971 Gordon & Jester, 1972	Gordon, 1967, 1969 a, b, c Costello, 1969 Schaefer, 1969 Ortar, 1971 Gordon & Jester, 1972
Parent as institutional changer				Ruopp, 1971 b	
Unspecified parent activities				Southwest Ed. Lab, 1969	

TABLE III

.Evaluation of HS Parent Participation Programs Assessment Procedures

Program Focus	A Pre-post Test cognit/lang	B Pre-post Test affective	C Unobstrusive Census Data	D Interview	E Questionnaire Rating Scale (self-report)	F Observation of Behavior, product (standard)	G Observation Behavior, process
Parent as Learner		Clarizio, 1968 Stern et al, 1970		Pickett, 1971			Juniper Gardens, 1968
Parent as Teacher of own Children	Swift, 1968 Boger, 1969	Gordon, 1969 Stern, 1970	Miller, 1968 Adkins, 1971	Gordon, Garber, 1970 Adkins, 1971 Bissell, 1971	Mandel, 1968	Gordon, Garber, 1970 Bronfennbrenner 1970 Bissell, 1971	
Parent as Institutional Changer				Ruopp, 1971a	OCD, 1970		
Parent as "participant"					Hervey, 1968 Jacobs, Pierce Jones, 1969 Fla. PE Program, 1971		

(a) Head Start

Pre-Post Testing

Two studies utilized pre-post test designs to measure the effects of group education experiences on parent as teacher. In a study of a few parents in Philadelphia, Swift (1968) used a battery of language abilities. She found that a program to help mothers learn to tell stories to their children increased mothers' language abilities in several dimensions. Boger (1969) measured the quality of mother-child interaction and mothers' story telling ability and found that mothers in specific content oriented intervention programs increased their own verbal linguistic skills as well as the quality of interaction with their children.

Stern and her colleagues at UCLA measured their first program (1968) by means of the UCLA alienation scale and found that, although there were no significant differences, there was a definite and consistent trend towards decreased feelings of alienation from society in those parents who were involved in the instructional program. The parents in the control group did not change.

Their second study (1970), using a group process approach, was assessed by measuring parents' expectations on three levels:

- Achievement of children in Head Start

- Parents' attitudes toward Head Start (PATHS).
- The "How I Feel" measure of alienation.

They found that participation in the encounters between parents and teacher did not lead to changes on these three measures.

Clarizio (1968) measured the effects of the use of a trained social worker responsible for school-home relations, who conducted group meetings and home visits and established a counseling relationship on an individual or group basis as the main means of parent contact, against the use of small group meetings conducted by regular staff with home visits only to collect demographic information. The effects of an eight-week experience were measured by a maternal attitude scale and a teacher rating scale. The first program was considered more geared to the family, and was found to influence attitudes toward parent-teacher relationships, towards school authority and towards the value of child's experiences, more than the second treatment. The latter was more effective than control. Although the directions were in the hoped for order, the differences were not significant.

The Florida Parent Educational Planned Variation approach (Gordon, 1969) used two self-report instruments: "How I See Myself" scale, a measure of self-esteem, and a

modification of the Rotter I.E. scale, a measure of the sense of internal control of reinforcement or of the sense of control. These measures were used with employed paraprofessional parent educators as well as parents. The results indicate movement towards higher self acceptance and greater feelings of internal control.

It must be indicated that pre-post experimental design types of evaluation efforts are not the only nor the most legitimate means for assessing the effects of programs. This is particularly true because of the sparcity of sound measures which take into account the varieties of subcultures and ethnic groups, the reasons for involvement and the needs for involvement of parents in programs. The experimental technique is probably most effectively used in small scale studies, and at this stage of our history, only after careful review by the Policy Council of just what these measures attempt to measure and why they are useful.

Unobtrusive Measures

Publicly available information which can be gathered without stressing participants or interfering with the conduct of the program can be used in evaluation. If the concern is with ultimate impacts, then measures of returning to school, increasing job rates, movement into better housing, increased use of health services, are all ways to assess parent as learner and parent as teacher.

The DARCEE studies (Miller, 1968) found that parents changed their life styles (housing, education, vocations, social actions, savings accounts) as a result of involvement in the home visit program. These are significant changes because they effect the total social environment of the family.

Adkins (1971) found that attrition was a useful process measure as well as product measure, and led to changes in program for the following year.

Another important use of unobtrusive data that must be stressed is that they can be used as both process and product measures. Assessment needs to address itself to these issues:

- Is the program as designed actually doing what it set out to do?
- Does it need modification as it goes along?
- What were its effects?

If the fundamental commitment to parent involvement in decision-making and to understanding and working with groups in partnership ways is paramount, then the evaluation designs must be flexible so that data are accumulated reflecting the continuing process. Changes which take place as the program evolves, as well as the assessment of outcomes must be considered. This approach is sophisticated and expensive but inescapable if we really wish to understand what such a program as Head Start is accomplishing in parent involvement.

Interviews

In the only published document we could find on Head Start parents in classrooms, Pickett (1971) interviewed eighteen parents in Wichita to find out their feelings about going into a Head Start classroom. The interviews were conducted in the homes on a one-to-one basis. There was some indication that it takes skill and time to get past the "tell it like they want to hear it" to the "tell it like it is" stage. From her extremely limited data in one center, however, it was clear that every parent knew about the right to be in the classroom, although a number did not exercise the right. When they were in the room, they seemed to be used as volunteer aides.

If parents are being asked or encouraged to work in classrooms as a means of modeling teaching behavior for them, then this small study indicated that while modeling may be going on, there were few explanations provided for parents and the modeling by itself was not seen as educational by the parents. Although only about half of the parents went to the classrooms the fact that one had the right to do so was indicated as of great importance.

Adkins (1971) interviewed the Hawaii parents and found differences between active and inactive mothers. Those who had volunteered and were frequently in classrooms increased their feelings of powerfulness and tolerance of other children and set high vocational and educational aims for

their children. Further, it was found that those children with language problems whose parents were high participants in the cognitive development program, gained significantly more than their classmates on almost all measures used.

Paraprofessional parent educators in the Florida program used a structured interview pre-post from which ratings were made about a number of variables in the home environment. Garber's (1969, 1972) Home Environment Review was the interview schedule. This is an adaptation of the Wolfe (1964) scale and is similar to a scale used in the Ypsilanti program. These data are still being processed, but upward movement was found on most of the nine dimensions of the scale in data processed to date in Follow Through.

The Stanford Research Institute conducted an evaluation of the eight Head Start Planned Variation models for the academic year 1969-70. Bissell (1971) reviewed and summarized these data. An interview was used to assess parent attitudes and parent involvement. Since there were several models, they were divided into such categories as: non-sponsored, (NS), prescriptive (Pre-academic skills) (P), discovery (D), cognitive-discovery (CD), and parent educator (PE) Here we are concerned primarily with the parent educator category.

The PE program was the Florida program of home visits by paraprofessionals, using material related to and

developed in the classroom. Parents were asked, "What are the things you liked most about Head Start?" Parents in the PE model made a higher percentage of responses to liking classroom climate and child-teacher relationship than any of the other groups (20% PE to 15% NS). Parents were also asked, "What differences has Head Start made in your home life this year?" Across the five categories, there were eight items on which any of the approaches had more than a 10% response. On four of these, the parent-educator model had higher than 10%: relationship to my own child (13.9), opportunity for learning (11.1), parent self-development learning (13.9), and relationship between teacher and child (13.9).

The PE model was the only one with over 10% on the last item, although this is not stressed in the model. This sample was extremely small and reflected only the first year of planned variation; however, the technique is viable and did indicate both model-related changes and differences between the models and regular Head Start classrooms, (Bissell, 1971, pages 27-29)

Another large scale survey was that conducted of Child Day Care Centers for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (Fitzsimmons and Rowe, 1971). As a phase of this effort, Ruopp (1971a) and a staff conducted on-site observations and interviews of both parents and staff members in a number of day care centers. The data are not presented •

in a quantified fashion, but he reported; "One central city teacher responded to a question about participation of parents as volunteers this way: "I think it's great, there are so many ways they can relate to other parents when I can't. They also have more insight into the children's problems. For this kind of program it's essential.' This kind of attitude explains why parents are deeply involved in the Center's operations: they are, quite simply, wanted and welcome." (ibid, page 12) He further reported that the interview data revealed that almost all parents know how the Center operates, who the staff are, what the staff are trying to do, how and why.

Questionnaire Rating

As a means of both a process and product assessment, Bessent of the Florida program has developed a parent response report which is being used this year. The parent educatcr administers the questionnaire at the beginning of the year. The results are being used to see where parents are in their understanding of the Policy Advisory Council. This leads to implementation activities, and the questionnaire will be readministered in the Spring to see if there has been movement.

The Office of Child Development gathered self-report data from centers for the program year 1968. Not only did this include data about Policy Advisory Committee membership (data were presented in relation to Table I), but also

statistics in terms of accompanying children on medical or dental visits, bringing children to class, holding informal discussions between teachers and parents. The report indicated that the impetus for parent development activities in 1968 were more often located in the center staff and center-wide parent group committee than either the PAC's or class parent groups. A measure of parent as institutional changer than would be whether that finding still holds true in 1971-1972.

Some questionnaire study needs to be developed to understand the ways in which lines of authority and responsibility are evolving, especially as we move from Planned Variation to such activities as Home Start. For example, will parents in Home Start form a mini-pac so that they have in effect a policy council for the Home Start program as distinct from the rest of the Head Start program? This is an important consideration which was uncovered in the Florida Planned Variation work. Questionnaire items for interviews, or any other means in Columns C and G should be used to see where the locus of control resides or is shifting.

Hervey (1968) and Jacobs, Peirce-Jones (1969) both developed attitude scales for assessing change. Hervey's scales measure punishment severity, obedience expectation, attitudes toward child rearing, and influence techniques. No differences were found between Head Start and non-Head

Start parents in attitudes toward educational matters. The Texas scales (Jacobs, Peirce-Jones, 1969) measure level of general optimism and aspiration level for the participating child, and found these were not changed by undefined "active participation."

Observation of Behavior: Product

The SRI study used as a standard measure of mother-child interaction styles, the eight-block sort task originally developed by Hess and Shipman (1966). The task requires the mother to teach her child to sort eight blocks and then for the child to do it. The data indicate that "within model classes, the largest gains are maternal dimensions made by parents of children in cognitive discovery and pre-academic classes," and that mothers in both regular and model classes changed from Fall to Spring in their styles of verbal interaction." (Bissell, 1971, page 25)

Olmsted, a member of the Florida group, has redesigned this "Mother as Teacher Task" to measure more specifically the desirable teaching behaviors being emphasized in the Florida Planned Variation program, and data are being gathered to assess more specifically the effects of this emphasis on parents'teaching behavior. The task has also been redesigned so that it is usable for Follow Through age children and mothers, as well as preschool.

Although Bronfenbrenner was not actively engaged in any

particular Head Start program, his comments about research are pertinent. He recommends, that in all research on the effects of family involvement, the primary focus [becomes] the study of changes in patterns of interaction between family members (especially parents) and the child, and the impact of these changes on the latter's psychological development -- social and emotional as well as cognitive. Even so crude a measure as the amount of time which various family members spend in direct interaction with the child might prove indicative of behavioral change. More instructive, however, in illuminating the nature of the changes taking place would be a series of standardized experimental situations administered at intervals of several weeks or months, in which the child would be presented with various 'problems' (e.g. toys, games, tasks to accomplish) in the presence of members of his family. The focus of observation would be not only the behavior of the child himself but equally the reaction of family members. Do they ignore, discourage, encourage, approve, help, or take over and do it themselves? Changes over time in reaction to family members could be studied both as a dependent variable (i.e., a function of the program being conducted with the parents) and as an independent variable (a factor affecting the behavior and psychological development of the child). (Bronfenbrenner, 1970, pages 66-67)

This is similar to the Mother as Teacher task, except Bronfenbrenner's suggestion places it into a more naturalistic framework. Parents and other family members can respond more in keeping with what they normally do, rather than respond to the structured teaching exercise of the Mother as Teacher task. Bronfenbrenner also points out that any measures of family involvement must be done in such ways that the power and prestige of the parent in the eyes of the child are enhanced rather than diminished. This is an important concept often overlooked by psychometricians who are more task oriented than people oriented. In programs such as Head Start, people must be considered more important than data.

Observation Behavior: Process

In several places we have indicated that assessment must be process as well as product oriented. The Juniper Gardens (1969) programs, because of its theoretical framework of operant conditioning, gathered continuous data on parent performance. The technique, although expensive, is useful in small scale studies or in sampling of particular program elements. These measures or records of parent behavior are immediately used as information for input into program.

This corresponds in the parent as learner category with the needs for such an approach in parent as institutional changer category. Some consistent monitoring, not only at the molecular level such as the Juniper Gardens approach,

but at a more molar level of studying the minutes of meetings to see the behavior of parents and staff at a Policy Council, can be utilized as the observation of process behavior for immediate utilization in the program.

Summary

In general, assessment of parent as teacher of his child has been more developed than any other focus. There are scales and observation techniques which are currently useful for continued evaluation in both process and product of this element of programs. The area of measurement of parent as decision maker is again the greatest weakness. Here unobtrusive measures, interview questionnaires, and observed behavior in meetings must be developed to study the way in which parents become decision makers, and the effects of this role on them and on the groups with whom they are sharing decision making roles.

The technology has not been well developed and there probably are not clear theoretical models. The small bits that do exist in the Kirshner data, the small scale MIDCO schedule, the recently developed Florida schedule, the Stanford Research Institute questionnaire developed for Follow Through offer leads for practical development in this area.

It has been suggested that evaluation be not only of end product, but also on a time series basis, in which samples are drawn throughout the life of the program to

to assess what is actually going, on whether what is going on is what was planned, whether program was purposely changed because of events, and what impact at that moment the program is having on the people involved. Assessment of parent participation must also be embedded in the social context of the particular community and cultural groups in that community. Case studies may be a more useful technique than national data compiled into a table which obscure the fact that each Head Start program in some fashion is special and unique.

The subject by treatment design has been discussed. In this case, subject would be the Head Start program rather than the individual. What can be extracted from such mix of process and product are generalizations about what types of programs or program elements seem to be more accepted and effective in relation to the characteristics of Head Start communities. To assume that a program that has been successful in place A can be transfeerred en toto to place B is naive. It should not be expected, therefore, that the evaluation of parent participation will lead to a standard manual or a consumer guide that can be applied in a simple form across our culturally pluralistic society.

(b) Non-Head Start

The items on Table IV indicate that even though many preschool programs existed which involved parents, evaluation of the parents themselves was rare. Levenstein

(1970) used pre-post IQ testing and found no differences between experimental and control groups, nor any change pre-post. Gordon (1969b) using the How I See Myself scale and the Social Reaction Inventory found no change in measured self-esteem, but significant changes in the feelings of more control over one's destiny in parents whose homes were visited in the baby's first year of life. The mothers were measured when the baby was three months old and twelve months old. Karnes (1970) reported that the mothers increased their community involvement in Head Start and other OEO activities, but did not indicate how these data were attained. The best guess is that they are anecdotal.

A number of studies utilized either open-ended or some form of standardized interview technique as either process or product measures. The research work of Wolf (1964) in relating a set of environmental press variables to scholastic achievement was a starting place for the development of several environmental process scales.

Radin and Sonquist (1968) used the Cognitive Home Environment scale in the Gale Preschool program, which utilized a mixture of classes plus home-tutorial sessions for disadvantaged four-year olds in the Ypsilanti public school system. "The children were tutored in their homes by the teachers every other week and as needed by the aide in alternate weeks during which time the work initiated by the teachers was continued and reinforced...

Activities for the tutorial sessions were on the basis of the child's needs, the mother's predisposition, the facilities in the home, and the ease of replication by the parents." (Radin and Sonquist, 1968, introduction). At the end of the program mothers reported that there were more articles for children to use; expectation for the amount of education their children had received had increased, and expectation for grades had decreased. Further, they found, "that there are no large differences in the cognitive stimulation taking place in the homes of Negro and white children." (ibid, page 14)

Radin (1969) used the same scale in a bi-weekly kindergarten home counseling program for a small group of 12 disadvantaged high ability students, who had previously participated in another preschool program. The counselor communicated children's progress, suggested areas needing strengthening, and planned activities for the mother to carry out. The mothers in this program were significantly higher on items on the Home Environment Scale when compared to parents whose children only attended supplementary classes. She further reported that children who have been involved in a preschool with intensive parent work (most likely the Gale or Perry programs) showed greater cognitive growth regardless of follow up programs.

A slight modification of the Ypsilanti schedule, called the Cognitive Home Environment Review, was used in an infant

study just completed by Gordon and Jester (1972) but results are not yet available. This scale is similar in many ways to the Home Environment Review developed by Garber and mentioned in relation to Head Start programs. It is a useful scale because it has been used in a variety of cultures, is generally acceptable to parents and has data relating scores on this to scores in scholastic achievement. The Garber form,although currently undergoing revision,is being used extensively in the Florida Follow Through program.

Ortar (1971) and Conant (1970) both used interviews as a way of studying the effects of program, but no standardized measures are reported.

Scheinfeld (1969) and Tuck (1971) used an interview as an entry for process measure in determining the structure and content of the program. The study focused on the parent's conceptual framework including child rearing. Parents were interviewed and asked about their views and methods of child rearing, their concepts concerning children, and their role. The materials introduced into the homes were based on parents' stated aims for their children. The worker then engaged in stimulating parent-child interaction and making comments and encouraging suggestions.

Six parents were then involved in informally interviewing close friends in the neighborhood and in turn moving into the worker role. Most program interviews of these

mothers showed that five had made progress and two in particular had moved to where they had grasped the meaning of "competent." Scheinfeld suggested that asking questions, followed by actions, followed by new questions enables parents to learn and get intrinsic rewards. They, in turn, will use this sequence with their children.

This "each one teach one" notion leads into the parent as institutional changer. Ruopp (1971) in the study of day care centers, used interview techniques to assess the roles parents played and the attitudes parents developed toward the program and toward themselves. Staff were also interviewed to assess their attitudes and reactions to program, children and parents. Ruopp provides excerpts from parents' comments, but no formal interview schedule. The comments range from positive ones about involvement, securing jobs, further education, etc; to negative statements about need for more community support, better relations with staff, parent-child discipline problems, and the need for all parents to be involved. What is indicated in the interview domain is a mixture of this type of open-ended inquiry with a more structured approach such as a home environment schedule or review. A new schedule could assess center factors, community factors, and the inter-relationships among home center and community.

The Southwest Educational Laboratory developed a schedule for attitudes toward education and child rearing

which was used to assess specified parent participation.

As in the case with the Head Start programs, most of non-Head Start parent intervention methods assume that there will be effects on the family life which in turn effect the child's development. Unfortunately, virtually all program evaluation is informal and anecdotal. A good deal is not even written but comes out in conversations and meetings and conferences.

There is a strong need to develop instrumentation in the area of parent as learner. One simple approach to assess changes in family life was used in the Home Learning Center project (Gordon, 1971). Parents brought their children in for testing when the children were three years old, and a questionnaire interview was conducted by trained interviewers. Items on this questionnaire referred to changes in size of family, family housing, marital status, as well as the parent's change in behavior and expectations for the child. Results indicated family behavior change toward better housing and toward family planning, with significant differences between experimentals and controls. Experimental mothers reported that they were significantly more involved in the learning of their children, in playing with them and in buying appropriate toys than were controls. Seventy-eight per-cent of the experimental mothers indicated that their child was smarter or able to learn faster than other children, or that he was making social progress. None

of the control mothers saw their child as superior. The questionnaire reveals then, both changes in parent as learner and parent as teacher of own child as results of involvement in the program.

Observation of Behavior

Bronfenbrenner suggested that a major approach to evaluation should be the observation of family behavior with the child. Very few programs have attempted to use some means of observed behavior as either a process or product measure, to influence program development or to examine results.

The Institute for Juvenile Research Projects (Costello, 1969, Scheinfeld, 1969, Tuck, 1971) working with a small group of families observed the gross behavior of parents, i.e. attendance at group functions, socializing with neighbors, etc. and then used these observations to develop programs relevant to each group. Not only did they find relationships between these parent behaviors and child behavior, but also that this was a useful system for targeting programs to meet parents needs.

The Florida programs (Gordon, 1967, 1972) developed a more structured observation schedule called the Parent Educator Weekly Report (PEWR). This is a schedule filled out at the end of each home visit by the paraprofessional. The PEWR is used in four ways:

- It provides a structured arrangement for being

sure that certain things happened on home visits.

- It supplies immediate monitoring information as to the way in which that parent educator and mother are working together; the mother's perceptions of the program and of the utility of the materials with her child.
- It provides outcome data of a descriptive statistical sort.
- Many of the items on this form are used in correlational fashion so that the within-program elements can be examined.

Ortar (1971) also used an observation of the mother with the young child in which the observer rated the language used. Schaefer's (1969) home visitors observed the behavior of mothers over the length of the project and rated them on a large number of behavioral type items in both the cognitive and affective domains.

The recently completed study (Gordon and Jester, 1972) in which the data are not yet fully analyzed, used a modification of a classroom observational schedule, the Reciprocal Category System and categorized the observed behavior of parent educator, mother and infant from video tapes made every six weeks for each of 128 families, between the child's third and twelfth birthday. This system yields not only a study of the process over that period of time, but also a product.

At the child's first birthday a standardized task was presented to experimental and control mothers and their performance in teaching this to the infant was video taped and coded. The data reveal differences in the instructional

behavior of mothers which related to the sex of the child, whether they were taught directly or were merely passive observers of the interaction between a home visitor and the infant and whether the home visitor was a professional or paraprofessional. The schedule since it did yield results offers the opening of a powerful approach by means of video tape and systematic observation analysis for the assessment of both process and product in parent participation programs.

Summary

The evaluation efforts yield several useful tools (home environment schedules and standardized interview and observation systems) and support the idea that assessment cannot be divorced from program development, but is a continuous mix of process and product, or to use some emerging language, formative and summative evaluation. The programs demonstrate the successful use of observation and interview techniques in moving toward arranging treatment to match subject. These are also applicable to the analysis of results, to see which elements of a program or whether a particular program in combination with home factors influenced parent attitudes and behavior. Again we note the absence of effective measures of parent as institutional changer, but most non-Head Start programs did not have this as a conscious goal.

Summing Up

Introduction

In constructing this report, we have organized our data around three questions.

- What were the theoretical orientations which influenced the development of Head Start, and particularly parent participation, in the program?
- How did Head Start policies reflect these theoretical orientations, and what were the forces that impacted decisions about parent participation through the course of time?
- What can be learned about parent participation from the literature and from practice, and how do these learnings relate to the theoretical underpinnings of the program?

Although a study such as this does not lend itself to easy summarization, the following is a recapitulation of the major points we have tried to make.

a. Theoretical Orientations

At the time that the anti-poverty program was initiated, there were, basically, two explanations for the cause of poverty and which pointed towards two different strategies for intervention.

One of these explanations we have described as the "deficit model." In this model, poverty was viewed largely as the result of deprivation. Things which should have happened to people, or experiences to which they should have been exposed, were either unavailable or denied to them. Consequently, they were living in a "culture of poverty" which a number of investigations or theorists felt was identifiable by a set of interlocking traits. From an educational point of view, these traits would consist of a lack of intellectual stimulation, a lack of verbal interaction between parents and children, a lack of appropriate educational materials in the home and the like. Since the opposite of these traits was felt to be characteristic of the middle class and since middle class children did better in school and in life generally, it was assumed that by providing poor people with an enriched educational environment, particularly in relation to their children, inroads would be made on the elimination of poverty and its associated characteristics.

This rationale, though more elaborate and sophisticated than presented here, was a dominant motif in the development of Head Start. It also provided one of the basic justifications for parent involvement, at least in the learner role. If the family is the prime influence on the early development of the child, and the family for whatever reason is deficient or inadequate, it follows that intervention into the family, whether this is done directly through family-based programs (e.g., Home Start)

or through more or less classroom-based programs (e.g., Head Start) would help change the characteristics of both children and parents and thus effect their behavior.

This particular theoretical orientation also fitted in with findings which, at that time were emerging from research. Bloom (1964), for example, had shown that early experience was important for "subsequent cognitive growth and education achievement" and there was also "a body of research and writings on the specific influence of home and maternal factors of the socialization of cognitive behavior in young children." (Hess, 1971, page 1).

It also, as it happened, fitted in with the way our society has divided the responsibility for the socialization of children. As Hess (1969) has shown, in the United States,

> "/F/amilies have ... primary responsibility for those aspects of child-rearing that include moral development, social responsibility and skills, emotional growth and stability, and other behavior loosely referred to as 'personality.' The school, on the other hand has been assigned the responsibility for cognitive and academic training and development."

If one accepts this formulation, it follows that one of the responsibilities of parents is to prepare a child for school (the "school readiness" concept) and that if children are not so prepared something has gone awry with the family.

In recent years, and even earlier, this formulation has been subject to considerable criticism. Many theorists have rejected the "culture of poverty" concept. They find it over-generalized, inadequate as an explanation, and in most ways not congruent with the data. Gordon, for example (See Appendix A) notes the tremendous heterogeneity among people who live in poverty and the great variability in parental attitudes and practice. Ryan (1971) makes a similar point, as does Hylan Lewis (Roth & Hill, 1967). To these researchers and critics -- and it should be noted that they all do not come at the problem in the same way -- poverty per se is not sufficient as an explanation for school performance.

An about-to-be published study by Christopher Jencks (1972) makes a similar point, but goes far beyond it. As reported in the press and in a magazine article that has preceded his book, Jencks concludes that the most significant variables in predicting school performance are the characteristics of the child. Jencks' more important point, however, is that no matter how well a child does in school, this has very little to do with his chances in life. This according to Jencks, is the result of a variety of factors, many of which are not clearly understood. Jencks appears to be clear about what is not relevant, however; it is not the school and it is not the family. His comparisons suggest that

> "... until we change the political and moral premises on which most Americans now operate, poverty and inequality will persist at pretty much their present level." (op.cit.)

Ultimately what Jencks seems to be saying is that improving schools or providing compensatory programs, such as Head Start, while possibly good in themselves, have little to do with the elimination of poverty. Sanford Kravitz, one of the people who shaped the Community Action Program, has made a similar point about Head Start. Though he does not denigrate Head Start's accomplishments, he notes,

> "... probably the most serious error of the entire Head Start program was in leading the nation to believe that the problem of poverty could truly be solved by education for three and four year old children." (Interview)

To a large extent, both Jencks and Kravitz would seem to be referring to the "deficit model" of poverty causation.

The other theoretical orientation which influenced anti-poverty programs, and thus Head Start as well -- but not we should add as much as the first -- was based on assumptions about the inadequacy of institutions or the maldistribution of power in society itself. In our review we referred to this combined emphasis as the "social structural model."

In this model, poverty, inadequate performance in school, and even one's life chances, have less to do with "cultural deprivation" than with the way our society is organized and functions. Here the emphasis is on defects or deficits in society, rather than on defects or deficits in people. It should be noted that this set of assumptions does not necessarily eleiminate or argue against compensatory programs or other efforts to improve the lot of the poor. Rather, it posits, that by themselves, compensatory programs will be insufficient to solve or eliminate the problem.

Again to quote Hess (1969, page 37):

> "... it seems likely that all models of deprivation must ultimately include the effects of social structure upon individual cognitive behavior and the need to modify that structure if intervention techniques are to succeed."

This model, like the deficit model, can take a number of forms. If the problem is defined as a lack of services or programs, it can focus on the generation of new resources. If the issue is maldistribution of services and programs, it can exert pressure in the way resources are allocated. If the problem is lack of relevance -- that is, the programs and services do not adequately reflect the life style and experiences, ethnic or otherwise, of the recipients -- efforts can be made to alter the nature of services and the way they are provided.

All of these approaches aim at institutional change; and it is in relation to this objective that the decision-making role for Head Start parents appears to have been articulated. This role is predicated on the assumption that parents are in the best position to keep programs relevant to their and their children's needs as well as to develop new programs and bring about changes in other institutions that effect their lives and well being. In this sense, parent participation in Head Start is a particular expression of the "maximum feasible participation" clause in the Economic Opportunity Act.

It is this aspect of parent participation that seems to have generated some concern. In part, this concern appears to be political in origin. As parents, or community groups, developed insight into their problems, and some muscle, in some instances the they began to challenge established institutions. This led to confrontations, conflict and sometimes to a backlash.

In terms of Head Start, the leading example was the Child Development Group of Mississippi, the largest Head Start program that ever was funded. In order to see that the gains made by children in the program were maintained, it was felt that the entire community had to change. To accomplish this goal, extensive efforts at community development were made. Although to a degree successful -- Mississippi is not the same as it was before the program -- it led to debilitating political battles in which the entire anti-poverty program, became involved.

It should be noted, however, that this occurred fairly early in the history of both Head Start and the larger anti-poverty effort. The few programs that took such risks soon found themselves under investigation, de-funded, or in other ways muted. This does not mean that the theory or the efforts were wrong; it means merely that the Federal government would not support them.

It should also be noted that, as the Kirschner study (1970) points out, local Head Start programs were instrumental in bringing about a rather sizeable number of changes in a number of institutions. By and large, however, these were changes in agency policies and practices rather than fundamental shifts in the way power in our society is organized and distributed.

The other criticism of parent participation in Head Start would seem to imply that the decision-making role has deleterious effects on the program and the children. <u>There is absolutely no evidence for this contention</u>. It is possible, of course, that Head Start parents sometimes make things difficult for the agencies that administer the local programs, for the people (frequently professionals) who run them, or for people who want to change or research them. But that is another matter entirely.* As the MIDCO Technical Report shows, parent-participation

* See Hess et al (1971 a) and the Kirschner study of parent-child centers (1970).

of both types -- learner and decision-maker -- have positive effects on all aspects of the program and when combined show further movement in a positive direction.

b. Head Start Policies

To a large extent, Head Start policies and programs appear to have resulted from the interplay of these rival philosophies or orientations, much as did the policies and programs of the entire anti-poverty effort. And just as in the anti-poverty program as a whole, the basic orientation was to the "deficit model." According to Stephen Rose (1970), for example, 94 percent of the community action programs were oriented to clinical, remedial or rehabilitative services.

In the development of Head Start policies, there appear to have been three discernible stages. These stages are characterized by an increasing emphasis on the role of the parents as decision-makers, though not, it should be noted, by muting or downgrading the role of parents as learners. As these policy statements developed, both roles were more precisely delineated, but because the decision-making role was virtually lacking from the original set of guidelines, the appearance and elaboration of this role in later sets is striking.

The first set of official guidelines were contained in a memorandum issued by the Professional Advisory Committee to the national Head Start program. This committee consisted of a number of distinguished early childhood specialists, educators, social workers, and pediatricians, all of whom played strategic roles in the development of the program.

The memorandum focused almost exclusively on the deficits induced in children by poverty, and outlined a program that would help overcome these deficits through medical, nutritional and educational services. Parents were conceived by the memorandum as adjuncts to this effort. They were to assist teachers as aides or volunteers, accompany children on field trips, and provide insight into life in the neighborhood. There were, however, two statements in these guidelines that, if interpreted very broadly provided an anchor for other parent roles and activities. These were:

- Developing in the child and his family a responsible attitude toward society and fostering constructive opportunities for society to work together with the poor in solving their problems.

- Increasing the sense of dignity and self-worth within the child and his family.

This memorandum was the only official set of Head Start guidelines until 1967, when, while still functioning within OEO, various Head Start policies were codified into a manual (6108-1, September 1967). While most of this manual is again about those components of the program which relate specifically to children, there is greater emphasis on parent participation.

The manual notes that every Head Start program must have "effective parent participation" and delineates four modes of such participation.

1. Participation in the process of making decisions about the nature and operation of the program;

2. Participation in the classroom as paid employees, volunteers, or observers;

3. Welcoming center staffs into their homes for discussions of the ways in which a parent can contribute to the child's development at home:

4. Educational activities for the parents which they have helped to develop.

Many of these practices, it should be noted, were already underway. But this is the first time, to our knowledge, that they were embodied in an official document.

There are at least two things about this memorandum that should be noted. (1) Not only is the decision-making role mentioned, but it is mentioned first. This suggests either that it was not happening and Head Start wanted it to happen; or that of all the roles, Head Start considered it the most important. (2) Decision-making, or participating in the decision-making process, is discussed only in relation to the Head Start program itself; the institutional change function in programs other than Head Start was not mentioned.

To operationalize the decision-making role, Head Start called for the development of a series of advisory committees at all levels of the program. At the center level the committees were to be elected but were to be composed preponderantly of parents, at the delegate agency and grantee levels, the committees were to be composed of at least 50 percent parents and they were to be democratically selected. (Emphasis added) What the rights, duties and obligations of these groups were supposed to be, however, was not spelled out.

These were important policy statements, and though they probably reflect what was already happening in the field,* they nevertheless represent an advance in official policy. One can only conjecture as to what motivated Head Start to issue the manual at that time and to elucidate these policies. Very likely it was a combination of circumstances; concern about the program and the way it was developing; pressures from the field as well as from within the bureaucracy; and possibly also some concern as to what might happen to the program as a result of its delegation to HEW, an agency that did not necessarily share OEO's philosophy.

With regard to these conjectures, some emphases in the manual are worth noting. On the first page, the manual places Head Start in the philosophical context of the Community Action Program generally. It notes that Head Start is, in a sense, a spin-off of the CAP, and the purpose of the CAP is to effect "a permanent increase in the ability of individuals, groups, and communities afflicted with poverty to improve their <u>own</u> conditions." (Emphasis added). Even more important, it notes that in the absence of a local community action agency, the agency responsible for administering Head Start is expected to follow the general principles of community action -- participation of the poor, mobilization of resources, and targeting of programs to the poor as if it were a community action agency.

To our knowledge this is the first time that emphases such as these

* The grantees for most Head Start programs are local community action agencies. In the absence of Head Start issuancies, CAP guidelines were frequently used for the formulation of policy.

appeared in official Head Start documents.

The third stage in the development of the parent-or-decision-maker role occurred in 1970 when a revision of the above manual, Instruction I-30, Section B-2, was issued. This Instruction delineates with considerable precision the roles of the various committees, drops the word 'advisory', thus making them policy committees or councils, indicates that at all levels, the parents should be elected rather than selected, and at each level gives the participating parents a veto over the other members.

While this shift in guidelines did not give parents control of the program, it did move them into a far more powerful position than they had previously enjoyed. One wonders, however, to what extent these guidelines have actually been followed. They do not, for example, contain enforcement provisions: Head Start grantees were not given a timetable for compliance, nor do there appear to be penalties for non-compliance. This suggests that the guidelines could be construed as suggestions rather than rules, and there is some evidence that this in fact may be the case. A recent study by the Southeastern Education Laboratory, for example, states: "We have the legal provisions, and often, as in Head Start, requirements to involve parents in pre-school programs, but to a great extent this is not happening." (Southeastern Educational Laboratory, 1971, page 16) Other observers feel that the guidelines are being followed, but to a variable extent; it is more evident in some circumstances than others. As we have seen, it is precisely in this area that adequate data is lacking.

Although the Instruction dwells mainly on decision-making within Head Start, the role of the program and of parents as institutional change agents is also mentioned. Two statements in the Instruction focus specifically on this area:

> "Many of the benefits of Head Start are rooted in 'change.' These changes must take place in the family itself, in the community, and in the attitudes of people and institutions that have an impact on both."
>
> "Successful parental involvement enters into every part of Head Start, influences other anti-poverty programs, helps bring about changes in institutions in the community, and works toward altering the social conditions that have formed the systems that surround the economically disadvantaged child and his family."

These statements, it is true, are in the transmittal notice that accompanied the Instruction and not in the body of the Instruction itself. Nevertheless, when one compares this issuance to the 1965 Cooke memorandum,the differences are striking. While the learner role has not been downgraded, it is clear that the decision-making role, both within as well as outside of Head Start, has been enhanced.

c. Review of the Literature

As part of this study, we commissioned an extensive review of reports and writings on Head Start since its inception. Aside from the data themselves, one over-arching fact emerges from this review: there is virtually no information on the decision-

making role of Head Start parents. As a contributor to this report remarks, this is the gaping hole in the Head Start literature. He goes even further: In his view a rationale for parent participation is not needed; the reasons for it are well understood. "What is missing are documented materials, either descriptive statistics of the extent of involvement, or measures of the effects. Involvement is built into Head Start but it has not been assessed." The MIDCO field study, which is discussed in the accompanying Technical Report, is a first, and therefore, preliminary effort in this direction.

Why or how this has happened, again, can only be conjectured at this time. A full-scale and much-needed biography of the program is yet to be written. A number of possibilities suggest themselves, however. It is possible that in the beginning, at least, the decision-making role was not considered as crucial to the program as was the learner role. This is a plausible conclusion to draw from the guidelines, as we have seen.

Another and possibly related reason, is the nature of the research itself. By and large, the focus of most of the research has been on parent/child interaction, particularly the effect of the mother's behavior on the child. A third reason, and one that is linked to the others, is the nature of the researchers, rather than the research. For the most part, research into early childhood is the province of child development specialists, most of whom are psychologists or educators. Both by training and in-

clination, their interest is in the early years of a child's development and their particular area of expertise is the influence of the family, and particularly mothers, on the growth and development of children. Consequently all we know, in the sense of having access to a body of literature, is what they have studied, researched and written about. Since their overwhelming interest has been in the parent as learner, rather than in the parent as decision-maker, it is not surprising that we know more about one role than about the other.

As to the data themselves, no attempt will be made to summarize them here, inasmuch as Part Two of our report is itself a summary. The strictures which Hess (1969, page 2) noted in earlier reviews of the literature, however, are perhaps worth stating as a caution.

> "... investigators of maternal behavior have a creative streak and flair for orignality. Rarely will they use a concept, a variable, a technique for gathering data, or a research population exactly as did another investigation. Nuances, variations and revisions abound; in effect, each of these studies is a single independent study. Since unreplicated results are only slightly better than no results at all, the research landscape ... tends towards clutter rather than clarity."

Some comments by Dr. Edward Zigler, until recently the director of the Office of Child Development at HEW, where Head Start is now housed, are perhaps equally pertinent.

> "On the current scene, there are many theories hypotheses, as well as blatant prejudices, but very little in the way of totally firmed-up information that will lead us unerringly along some social action path. We still have to use our own judgment and play our best hunches.

> We must therefore develop enough professional and personal integrity so that we are not unduly influenced by every passing thought that has the good fortune to be published."*

Neither we, nor certainly Dr. Zigler who is a distinguished researcher himself, are denigrating research. Our point is merely to emphasize, that while the "knowledge explosion", particularly in relation to early childhood, has brought us a long way, there is an equally long way to go. Furthermore, as we have tried to emphasize in this report, it is doubtful that research or knowledge alone is the only or even the chief influence on the direction of programs. As the Head Start experience has shown, decisions are usually the result of the clash of a variety of forces. In the end, it would seem, they are made by people who have the power to make them.

---

* Speech delivered at the 1970 Annual meeting of the Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc. Unpublished.

APPENDIX A

Characteristics of Head Start and Other Parents on Variables Related to Child Development

This appendix is an overview of the research on the characteristics of Head Start and non-Head Start parents as they relate to variables of child development. The mass of studies refer to intra-family variables and deal with the behaviors or attitudes of parents (predominantly mothers) which have observable and measurable effects on child performance or on school achievement. Although measures of language and intelligence are under increasing attack for psychological, social and technical reasons, the studies cited here have placed a heavy reliance upon them.

Reviews of Literature

Two reviewers (Hess, 1969; Hess et al.,1971; Gordon, 1969, 1970) offer conceptualizations as well as sources for research done before those dates on the impact of parent attitudes and behaviors upon the child. Hess' updated review (1971) emphasizes the importance of the family as the place in which primary attachments are made and includes the implication that no program should interfere with the child's ability to form primary attachments. Since these occur in the first year of life, the implication has particular relevance to infant day care. This review suggests nine categories of parent behavior which influence child development.

1. Independence training.
2. Warmth and high emotional involvement.
3. Consistency of discipline.
4. Explanatory control.
5. Expectation for success.

6. Parents' sense of control.

7. The verbalness of the home.

8. Parents' direct teaching.

9. Parental self-esteem.

G. Miller (1971) as preparation for his study of the effects of families on the scholastic performance of English children, reviewed the literature with perhaps more attention to non-American studies and to the affective domain. He investigated four groups of studies dealing with social class, anxiety, child adult relationships, developmental tasks. He found that the gross label of social class was somewhat useful, but that the factors within the home, not necessarily related to social class, were most important. For example, Campbell's (1951) study of secondary school children found that the kinds of books, newspapers, journals and radio programs, the attendance at cultural events, and the attitudes of parents to education all related to success in the secondary school.

A number of other studies he cited all seem to center on a few variables which are similar to American findings:

1. Parental discord and emotional and abnormal home relationships.

2. Parents' plans for further education.

3. Parents' aspirations and amount of pressure exerted.

4. Economic factors.

5. School grouping practices.

6. Parents' attitude toward school.

7. The teacher's conscious or unconscious evaluation of children which effects their assignment to streams (in the United States, ability groups).

8. Restricted language codes.

These were all specific variables within social class designation which influenced performance.

The second group of studies are those Miller labeled child-adult relationships. Reviewing the essentially psychoanalytic literature, he concluded that "these studies are relevant to any study that concerns itself with the growth of intelligence and intelligent behavior, and particularly the academic attainment. All emphasize that intelligent behavior is optimally developed in a situation where there is acceptance, warmth, predictability and flexible free interaction " (Miller, 1971, p. 45). Of special importance in the Miller work is the replication of findings of parental factors across cultures, not only in England but in Western Europe. This, plus those studies which will be cited below, and the work of Smilansky (1968) described in Gordon (1970) enable us to see that it is possible to single out variables which seem to have universal meaning. Given the view that there are some universals, it is nevertheless important to recognize that the specific ways in which they may be implemented and the way they may fit into a total family context might differ widely.

Research not in Reviews

A number of studies both here and abroad investigated the effects of family variables on child school performance. Cox (1968) in a study to identify the family background and parental-child rearing practice variables which influenced child personality, self-concept, and peer relationships, studied junior high school aged children near Fort Worth, Texas. Through the use of interviews, questionnaires, tests and rating forms, plus sociometric rating data, he found that parental love or rejection of the child significantly influenced the child's character and his social peer acceptance.

Smykal (1962) found through the use of the Gough-Sanford Rigidity Scale and a semantic differential with mothers, and the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale with fathers of high school students, that parental attitudes were significant variables in predicting achieving and under-achieving behavior of able students.

Keeves' (1970) investigation of sixth grade children and first grade high school children in the Australian Capital Territory (sample limited to English speaking homes) used three dimensions to organize the home environment information:

1. The structural dimension was concerned with sociological and demographic characteristics.
2. The attitudinal dimension was concerned with attitudes, expectations, and ambitions.
3. The process dimension concerned itself with the practices of the home fostering learning and cognitive development.

From this study Keeves (1970, pp5-7) identified seven variables:

1. Achievement press of the home.
2. Independence training in the home.
3. Work habits and press for order in the home.
4. Affiliation in the home and between home and school.
5. Provision in the home of stimulation for cognitive development.
6. Language models and emphasis on language development.
7. Academic guidance provided by the home.

Using interview techniques with parents and test data on children, Keeves developed an extensive multivariate approach to the analysis of these variables upon child performance (achievement tests). He concluded:

> The importance of the mothers' attitudes and ambitions stand out clearly, but are exceeded in importance by the provision made in the home for

> stimulation to learn and to promote intellectual development... To ascribe differences in the levels of educational achievement of children to class or father's occupation, as is common, would seem to over-simplify the relationships involved; it is the attitudes and the practices of the home which have the more direct influence (op. cit., pp. 29-30).

G. Miller (1971) attempted to discover aspects of social and personal adjustment to the child most associated with academic success and failure. His sample was an entire population of the top primary classes of ten schools in two contrasting suburbs (one middle class, one industrial) consisting of about 500 children. He found that:

> Family size correlated with lower achievement and that children who gain most from educational opportunity tend strongly to come from homes where independent thinking and freedom of discussion among all members is the rule; where there are values conducive to intellectual effort and enterprise; and where the children's curiosity and academic aspirations are supported and encouraged by parents. The parents do not overindulge them; the children themselves are confident in their intellectual skills (the opposite to being anxious); and they perceive harmony between the values of their home and those of the school.
>
> On the negative side, children who gain the least educational opportunity tend strongly to come from homes where their thought is dominated by their parents, and the children themselves accept this as reasonable. There is a climate of general deprivation, with elements of social, cultural, intellectual, and emotional deprivation. Parents are punitive and autocratic, and make their children feel inferior to other children. They also tend to over-protect them, yet the children do not feel that their parents are as accessible as they would like them to be. The children also tend to have uneasy peer relationships.
>
> Factors which adversely affect educational opportunity and achievement, while more likely to be found in working-class families, are also prevalent in some middle-class families to a greater extent than one would gather from the literature, and than is popularly thought. Most of the influential factors are largely independent of social class. (Miller, 1971, p. 109)

These lengthy quotations from Keeves and Miller illustrate again that while social class factors in a large sense may be important, the particular behaviors which transcend these are more significant.

Head Start Studies

Head Start studies have investigated the characteristics of parents in attempts to see how these characteristics influence either parent involvement or child behavior. The Hess studies (1966, 1969) whose findings are included in Hess' reviews, are presented here, not so much for their data, but for the measurement techniques. They found that academic grades and standardized test scores of children showed a pattern of significant relationships to maternal control strategies, teaching styles, and affective behavior. The measures used were:

1. Four performance sub-tests of the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale.
2. Items from the Minnesota Multi-Phasic Personality Inventory, orally administered.
3. The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, to draw a circle slowly.
4. The Rotter Internality-Externality Scale.
5. The James Locus of Control Inventory, an interview about recent events.
6. The Kagan Matching Familiar Figures test.

In addition to these measures, father presence and measures of home and community environment (crowding and home resources) were also secured.

Of special importance here was the finding about sex differences. It was found (Hess, 1969a) that cognitive environment had a greater impact on girls' readiness than on boys', and the girls' behavior was more closely related to maternal cognitive behavior, but perhaps less influenced by mother's affective behavior.

Holmes and Holmes (1966) investigated whether parent characteristics influenced children's performance in Head Start. In the study conducted in New York, they contacted middle class families (MC) parents who sought entry for their children into Head Start (SR) a group whom Head Start personnel sought out and whose children participated (SAP) and a group who were re-

recruited but did not participate (SANP). They found that although the income level of the SR, SAP, and SANP groups were alike, there were significant differences in attitudes and behavior. The parents of the SR group followed a more middle class pattern at home (separate bed, appropriate books, eating with parents) and had somewhat higher job status than the other two groups. The SR parents also had higher aspirations for their children and were more informed about the community. In spite of the same difficult situation, their motivation seemed quite different. Although there were similarities between SR parents and MC parents, they differed in that the SR aspired to middle class jobs for their children while middle class parents were more concerned with self fulfillment and self determination. The SR parents were concerned with the mobility enhancing aspects of school, the MC with its creative function. Those children whose parents chose not to participate, were less verbal than SR children and had lower scores on tests of visual motor organization than any other group. Their parents' isolation was reflected in child performance. One can conclude that income does not lead to homogeneity.

Hervey (1968) investigated the differences between Head Start and non-Head Start parents. Both mothers and fathers were interviewed. She found no significant differences in attitude toward educational matters, and that overall, there were no significant patterns of differences between the two groups.

McNamara et al. (1968) examined the differences in family background of children who were seen as having high self-concept compared to low. The scale used was the parental punitiveness scale developed by Epstein and Komorita.

Grotberg's (1969) review of several studies also concluded that there were differences in parents between those who elect to participate and those who are recruited, and that these differences are reflected in the children. It

appears that Head Start parents' attitudes toward education are much like middle class mothers, however, this may be confined to that group of parents who choose to involve their children in such programs.

Scheinfelds' work (1969) found that if parents were observed to be oriented toward active engagement with the environment, then almost certainly the children were doing well in the preschool. Parents who were achieving had an exchange theory of child rearing, that is , in order for them to get desired results from children, they had to be attentive, affectionate and meet the child's material needs. These parents also felt connected to the environment and had a sense of continuity with the past and with people from the past. Scheinfeld's notion of active engagement, i.e. asking questions, utilizing input, posing new questions, relates very closely to the label "direct teaching" listed as a key variable in the Hess and Gordon reviews and the Miller and Keeves researches. It is further closely allied to the type of parent behaviors which relate to competency in infants.

A Dutch study (Rupp, 1969) with one English summary chapter, describes the early stages of a program for working with preschool parents to develop what Rupp calls "school resistant" children. These are children whose family life will have been so influential along the dimensions indicated above, that the children will enter school with a high ability to cope and succeed, even if the school offers an aversive environment. Here again, we see the common thread of parental factors in yet another culture.

Infancy

As a part of the programmatic investigation of the effects of parent education in disadvantaged homes beginning when children were 3 months of age, Gordon and associates (1969 a,b,c, 1970, 1971) investigated a number of demograph-

ic, as well as process, home variables. Among them were such variables as density and crowding, age of the mother, years of education, number of children, multiple mothering (meaning that home visits were made to a variety of different adults who were handling the child), disruption during parent education visits. Generally, these demographic factors did not relate to child performance at either age one or two, yet there was a clear tendency for children of single mothers to do less well than married.

As a part of this study, McCulley (in Gordon, 1969c) developed a semantic differential to assess mothers' concept of ideal child. No race differences were found on this scale, but there were discrepancies between mother's view of ideal and her own child, which related to child performance. When the mother's view of her daughter was lower than her view of an ideal child, the daughter tended to perform better than those who most resembled their mother's ideal. However, for the boys, those resembling maternal ideal outscored the least on all our measures. This may relate to the Kagan and Moss position on differential socialization and its effects on achievement.

A just completed study which was a partical replication of the original infant study (Gordon & Jester, 1972) more clearly indicates sex differences in the observed teaching behavior and socialization behavior of both professional and paraprofessional parent educators and mothers when working with children between three and twelve months of age. These differential behaviors relate more clearly for the girls in performance at age one on Bayley scales; that is, girls whose mothers spend more time in direct teaching interaction outscore those whose mothers spend less time. There is not as clear a picture for the boys.

The Harvard Pre-School Project, using naturalistic observation, is investigating the relationship between mothers' actions toward her infant and child competence. White (1972) summarizes the information by listing a set of "best" guesses about most effective child reading practices. These are:

1. Designs a physical world, mainly in the home, that is beautifully suited to nurturing the burgeoning curiosity of the one to three year old. (One that contains many objects and materials for the child to handle, play with, look at, and react to,)
2. Sets up guides for her child's behavior...she is generally permissive and indulgent. The child is encouraged in the vast majority of his explorations (White, 1972, p.32).

White describes the interaction which takes place when the child finds something interesting as "10 to 30 second interchanges...usually oriented around the child's interest of the moment rather than towards some need or interest of the mother " (p. 32). The general procedure utilized in the Harvard Pre-School Project is the observation of natural behavior in contrast to the staged teaching events used in Gordon and Jester (1972).

The investigations by Yarrow and his associates (1971) used observation in middle class and disadvantaged homes containing five to six month old black infants. They assessed both the inanimate environment and the social stimulation, and related scores on these to Bayley clusters of children's performance at age six months. As White indicated, the presence of a large variety of objects is an important factor in competence development, and even at this age the number of inanimate objects stood out as an especially significant factor.

When we turn to social stimulation variables, positive affect and the level of response, the variety of response, contingent responses to distress, and contingent responses to positive vocalizations yielded significant correlations to a variety of measures of infant functioning. There were three measures of goal-directed behavior for infants:

1. Goal-orientation.
2. Reaching and grasping.

3. Secondary circulary reaction.

Mothers contingent response to distress related to all three of these measures. The level, variety and positive affect related to the first and third. The mental development index related to both the level and variety of the mother's social stimulation. Sex differences indicated that these relationships between maternal behavior and infant response were higher, generally, for the girls.

Bell (1970) sampled 33 middle class babies between 8½ and 11 months of age, and tested them for object permanence and person permanence. She interviewed the mothers to find out how frequently they played such games as peek-a-boo, or took babies on outings. Observers noted instances of punishment, rejection, or interference with the babies' activity by the mother during home visits. She found that differences in the rate of development of person permanence were related to the quality of attachment behavior that the baby showed toward the mother. She concluded that "there is an important dimension affecting the development of the object concept which transcends socio-economic boundaries and often goes unexamined in studies aiming to isolate the essential features of 'enrichment' or 'deprivation'. Specifically, the findings of the present study lead us to the hypotheses that the quality of a baby's interaction with his mother is one of the crucial dimensions of 'environmental influence' which affects this type of sensory-motor development " (Bell, 1970, p. 310).

Wachs, Uzgiris, and Hunt (1971) related the observed behavior of parents and demographic home environment factors to childrens' performance on Piaget type activities at seven, eleven, fifteen and twenty-two months. Items which consistently related to successful performance were:

> There is at least one magazine placed where the child could play with it or look at it; the child was given regular training in one or more skills; the mother spontaneously vocalizes to the child; the mother spontaneously names at least one object to the child while the observer is in the home; the father helped take care of the child; the father played with the child

at least 10 minutes a day; the child is regularly spoken to by parents during meal times (pp. 295-304).

Those factors which seem to have a negative effect were:

The child cannot escape noises in the home; the mother and child go visiting outside the neighborhood almost every day; the television is on most of the time when the observer is there; the house has a very high sound level; the house is both noisy and small; neighbors come over almost every day to visit (Wachs et al., pp. 295-304).

These infant studies share several elements. Variables are found, most often process rather than demographic, which relate to child's performance in the first year of life. Such factors as social class hide more than they reveal in uncovering the process variables. Families who are classified as "poverty" display a tremendous variety of child rearing practices and attitudes which relate to child performance.

When the same studies are examined focusing primarily on adult verbal behavior, the picture becomes even clearer. The Florida studies (Gordon, 1969c; Bradshaw, 1969; Jester and Bayley, 1969; Resnick, 1972) all clearly indicate that the amount of conversation in the home, particularly the amount directed toward the child, relates significantly to child performance. The Wachs study (1971) contained such items. White indicated that "these effective mothers talk a great deal to their infants " (White, 1972, p. 33). None of these studies is concerned with the formal grammar type of content or analysis of speech. The issue here is the amount of language directed toward the child and the encouragement and modeling the child receives for engaging in language behavior.

Cole and Bruner (1972) in their review of the issues of difference vs. deficit, examine the linguistic position and some of the other language performance data which tend to indicate that what may have been formerly considered deficits in language ability or language capacity are more correctly seen as differences in language performance.

The infant studies suggest the importance of language behavior surrounding the child with what could be called a "language envelope," particularly when the child is included within the envelope. The type of speech pattern is irrelevant, the presence of speech is what is important. As G. Miller (1971) indicated, freedom of discussion is an important variable within the home.

The stimulation of language interaction of questioning, discussion, debate are the important elements in influencing child thought. The particular structure of the language is not significant, since all languages offer the means for their use for thought.

Parent Self-Regarding Attitudes

How does the parent's own attitude toward himself or herself affect child development? A basic assumption discussed in Table I was that if parents feel good about themselves and have high self-esteem, this will in turn influence the child. The reverse would also appear to be true. Cox (1968) found that interpersonal tensions within the family had a disrupting influence, not only on child rearing practices but also on the child's personality development and his social acceptance by peers. McCarthy's (1968) study of some Head Start families found that parents tended to show little trust in their children and to feel inadequate in parental roles, but provided no data on how this related to child performance.

Costello et al. (1969) found that children of parents described as outgoing and comfortable vs. alienated and non-social, clearly related to the performance of children. The children of outgoing parents were judged most competent, i.e. were trustful, had developed some internalized control and direction over their impulses, were free to express their concerns, were effective in manipulating, controlling and enjoying their world. The children of alienated parents were

judged least competent in their degree of involvement and organization in approaching people and things, were distrustful and had little curiosity.

White's (1972) list of the variables defined as competence included a variety of social abilities, planning the use of resources, the ability to deal with abstractions, or what might be called intellectual competence in 3, 4, and 5 year old children. The infants were judged on competence on the social skills, two receptive language measures, capacity for abstract thinking, and the capacity to sense dissidence or note discrepancies. In addition to the behavior toward the child, White suggests that the effective parent, the one who stimulates the child to become competent, views life in general positively, seems to derive pleasure out of being with a young child, is more concerned about the child than about material possessions. She is also more prone to take risks (pp. 33-36). This may be so because she has developed a sense of trust for the child.

White further identified two resources important to competence:

1. "The most basic necessary resource is energy " (p. 36). To have ample energy is not only a temperamental trait, but obviously requires good nutritional basis. General life circumstances above the survival level are essential.
2. A secondary necessary resource is patience (p. 36). The ability to be patient cannot be abstracted from the complex circumstances in which many of our parents must rear children.

Central to the Florida studies was the idea that parents' self-esteem was an important variable in child performance. Two dissertations (Herman, 1970; Etheridge, 1971) explored the relationships between mothers' self-esteem, sense of internal control, positive attitudes towards the project, and child performance on Bayley's scales at age two. This is a more restricted and debatable definition of competence. In both studies, sex differences were significant. The impact of mother's attitudes was more critical for boys than for girls, but

overall, the way in which the mother saw herself and felt about her own control and felt toward the project were positively related to child performance.

In Etheridges' study, marital status alone was not significant but entered into the interaction with attitude in effecting performance. He found, too, that the male infant's overall performance, and particularly his mental perfo ance, was more related to the style of mothering than was the female infant's performance (p. 145). In addition to using just mental scores, Schaefer's (1969) task-oriented behavior factor, a cluster of items on the child's behavior during testing, was also part of the measure.

Parents' Attitude Toward Community

As indicated on Table V, little work was uncovered relating parents' attitudes to child performance along this dimension. There were a few indications among the items listed in relation to columns A and C; that is a self-regarding attitude of feeling one has control is also an attitude toward the community. But no recent systematic undertakings were located.

Hess (1969b) described the impact of environment on adults but described mostly what it does to their attitudes towards themselves (pp. 27, 29). He indicated that:

1. They tend to perceive and structure social relationships in terms of power.
2. Mistrust the unfamiliar and as a corrollary, reject intellectuality.

Anthropologists have long indicated the importance of extended family relationships in many cultures, and this seems to serve as a survival technique, at least for rural poor (Bradshaw, 1969). There has been much discussion and general comment about parent's attitudes towards schools, institutions, and agencies, but little hard organized data. This should be an area of vital concern

in the organization and evaluation of parent involvement programs in Head Start.

Grotberg's (1969) review indicated that parents said they were pleased to be in programs. The Chicago studies (Costello, 1969; Scheinfeld, 1969) indicated a certain proportion of parents reluctant to be involved and Holmes and Holmes (1966) indirectly looked at this to be describing parents who chose not to particpate, and the fact that their children joined after recruiting. The community control literature reveals that there were many parents who distrust schools as well as other agencies. What is missing is what effect this actually has on their children.

From the point of view of Head Start, a major issue is how does one establish any relationship with people who distrust? How do you begin to develop a trust pattern, and ways of reaching them and their children, to enable them to utilize the kinds of ideas and information represented in this discussion of Table V.

Parent Ethnic/Cultural Membership

Reviews of Literature:

Throughout this report we have indicated that programs must be related to the groups involved, and that in this country with its cultural pluralism, parent involvement programs must be so organized that parent input can serve to increase children's self-regard and regard for their heritage. Further, respect for ethnicity should also mean that programs will educate members of various ethnic groups to understand each other, so that each can gain from the richness of the other. Throughout this report the position has been taken that deprivation or disadvantage does not mean deficit, and that parents have much to contribute not only to their own children, but to other adults from agencies and other groups. Here we are concerned with the

effects of ethnic membership on the development of the child. It is an area of considerable debate because it is virtually impossible to isolate any single variable and assign all causation to it.

Perhaps the best single review of the overall literature is that by Boger and Ambron (1969). Although they review some of the same studies as Hess and Gordon, their conceptual scheme relates more closely to this subject. Their Figure 1 (from Boger & Ambron, 1969) shows the multiple cells in the matrix of variables which effect the child. Any child can be assigned to a set of cells such that he would be identified as an upper-lower-class male, black American from the rural South. The implication is that each adjective contributes, not only to defining him, but represents a set of cultural elements which influence his development. Figure 3 presents a behavioral model which illustrates how this subpopulation matrix affects a set of psychoeducational dimensions and how a set of process variables also influence these same dimensions. The connecting line between the matrix and the process variables was added in this review.

There is a resemblance in their thinking to the conceptualization of Keeves (1970); their figure includes structural and process dimensions, both of which influence psychoeducational dimensions in the child. However, many of the interrelationships are not carefully understood, nor should anyone assume that there will be any high correlation between single cell in the matrix, and single process variable, and any single psychoeducational dimension. The order of relationships will probably be significantly different from chance, but a long way from accounting for a high degree of the variance in child behavior. This suggests that it will take multi-variate designs in which ethnic membership will be an important contributor, examined in conjunction with the variety of other characteristics we have been describing.

In line with the findings concerning sex differences in children's

performance in relation to parental factors, it would seem especially important that ideas such as those of Grier and Cobbs (1968) on maternal behavior toward black sons and the studies of the role of the male in the Chicano culture of Tastaneda et al. (1971) and Billingsley's (1968) picture of the black family should be taken into account in both program development and evaluation.

Cole and Bruner (1972) proposed an approach to a theory of cultural difference in which they suggested that traditional experimental, psychometric approaches have not taken into account the cultural meanings and situations in which they have been applied. They suggest that, "the crux of the argument, when applied to the problem of 'cultural deprivation' is that those groups ordinarily diagnosed as culturally deprived have the same underlying competence as those in the mainstream of the dominant culture, the differences in performance being accounted for by the situation and contexts in which the competence is expressed" (Cole & Bruner, 1972, no final page numbers).

They suggested that we need to clarify our thinking about what competencies really underlie effective performance, and then develop programs built upon them. They concluded: "When cultures are in competition for resources, as they are today, the psychologists task is to analyze the source of cultural difference so that those of the minority, less powerful group, may quickly acquire the intellectual instruments necessary for success of the dominant culture, should they so choose" (1972, no final page numbers).

A careful reading of the material in this section indicates that the parental behavior which has been found to relate to competence in children can be readily made available. Various programs, particularly of home visitation, offer delivery systems for fairly rapid dissemination of those procedures which, if the parents choose to use them, will have positive impacts on their children.

School-age Children

Keller (1963) compared aspects of after school and home activities of a group of poor black and white children in New York City public schools to distinguish family life, self image and recreational activities of these children from middle class peers. Forty-six families received questionnaires by mail and reported that their children had a lack of sustained interaction with adult members of the families. Only about half regularly ate a meal with one or both parents, and the main activities of the children were television and peer play. Parental aspirations for children were high. Four-fifths wanted their children to attain a college degree.

The questionnaire was followed up by private interviews in ten homes, in which more realistic expectations of the desire of security and steady work for their children were indicated. When socio-economic factors were controlled, Keller found racial differences in the social environment. For example, nearly all of the white families were satisfied with the child's school work, only half the black families were. Three-fourths of the black families at that time thought they were going up in the world, only one-third of the white families thought so. The income level of the black families was lower and more were receiving AFDC. It is important to notice the difference between objective information on income and subjective attributes of their environment, rather than the actual objective level of living.

Head Start

Within the context of Head Start and similar programs, several researchers addressed themselves to ethnic variables. Henderson (1967) found significant relationships between a modified version of the Wolf scale (environmental press) and the Van Alstyne Picture Vocabulary Test and the Goodenough-Harris Drawing Test. His sample was Chicano children from Southwestern states. Garber (1968)

used a similar Wolf derivative and found differences between poor Navajos, Pueblos, and Chicanos in family response, and relationships between these pattern of response and child performance on the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Ability and the Caldwell Preschool Inventory. These two studies, along with others cited, indicate that within ethnic and poverty groups, differences in family behavior influence child performance.

In support of the Cole/Bruner position, Feldman's and Shen's (1971) compared Head Start bilingual and monolingual children's performance on object constancy, switching names, using names in sentences, knowledge of names and facility for acquiring new names. Contrary to old myths, the bilingual children were superior on the first three and equal on the next two to the monolinguals. Bilingualism may be a deficit only when attitudes in communities and schools make it so.

Tuck (1971) worked with black fathers as a part of the Institute for Juvenile Research efforts described earlier. He suggested that if an indirect approach is used, many black fathers can be mobilized to provide much of the emotional and positive experience support necessary for the development of their children. The sequential model he described was:

1. Strive to establish a trust-working relationship with a few fathers.
2. Actively engage these fathers in recruiting others.
3. Try to relate father-child activities to types of vocations or outdoor activities.
4. The group should be exclusively male.
5. It should plan special activities for children.
6. Encourage fathers to support and carry out activities with their wives.
7. Have fathers, along with their wives, design projects with their children.

In a very small pilot program project with four fathers, using a black male family worker, Tuck found that organizing activities different from those normally supervised by wives or older children, was a necessary development. Some of the activities were: showing cartoon movies, free fun fair, free mothers' day parties, little league baseball, and field trips. These fathers are presently involved in joining with other community groups to open a local supermarket and establish a community controlled credit union in the neighborhood. A major point made by Tuck is that the fathers always supplied cues as to the direction in which the group was to move, and a major shift was toward community control or power. Parenthetically, Gordon has found that in his Follow Through experience, the policy advisory council or the Head Start policy council offers a major place for the involvement of fathers. It is a prestigious role, carries power and dignity, and fits with the cultural image of male activity.

Bell (1967, 1968) in two studies cited by Grotberg (1971) found that both black and white mothers were generally positive about Head Start, and particularly pleased about the social development of their children. The black mothers had high aspirations for their children, but felt that in reality the amount of education they wanted would not be achieved. They perceived themselves as most important to their children, with teachers second, and fathers third. White mothers, on the other hand, had very low educational aspirations for their children and about a third claimed grade school would be all their children would have. No data were presented as to the effects of these attitudes on these children, but the general research suggests that low aspiration levels diminish the childs' aspiration level and diminish his performance. In this respect, the higher aspirations of the

black mothers provide their children with a more positive base than the low aspirations of the white.

Slaughter (1969) investigated the aspiration levels of black mothers for their children as a part of the larger Hess project. Her theoretical orientation was that subcultural pressures limit resources available to mothers, and therefore their perceptions of available alternatives. She interviewed 90 mothers and coded their behavior during a summer Head Start. She found that maternal behavior had a significant influence, and that maternal individuation (the quality of communication between mother and child) was more highly associated with achievement than warmth or values for school achievement or social contact.

In a follow up study, Slaughter (1970) used an educational attitude survey developed at the Chicago Urban Center, which focused on attitudes toward education and the public school system. Seventy-two working class mothers of inner city kindergarten children responded. Analysis of the data suggested that the mother's preparatory teaching behavior plus her behaviors with focus on teaching or informing, the extent of her stimulation and encouragement of relevant verbal communication between self and child was related to child performance. The factor called futility was not found to be significantly correlated to child's achievement. This factor consisted of the following items: "If I disagree with the principal that there is very little I can do. I can do very little to improve the schools. Most children have to be made to learn. Most teachers probably like quiet children better than active ones" (p. 436).

What is significant about these two studies and the Florida study, is that even within a group that shares several common attributes in the Boger and Ambron matrix (in Slaughter's case, black female northern urban lower class, and in the Florida case, black female southern rural lower class) there is still considerable variation in parental attitude and behavior. This variation

is sufficiently large to account for the significant proportion of the variation in child performance either on test measures or in school. Such studies should warn us against the dangers of attributing or assuming a pattern of behavior on the basis of knowledge of a few external attributes.

Summary

The research literature, in spite of issues concerning measurement techniques or anthropological insights, provides sufficient redundancy of studies done on a variety of populations in many different countries to establish clearly that there are a set of parent attitudes and behavior which occur in the home which influence child development in both intellectual and personality domains. Further, although there are gross variables into which groups can be assigned, the data are quite clear than within these groups one cannot predict the behavior of an individual family by group membership. Therefore, programs designed to involve parents so that the home situations can become more optimal, or so that parents can influence agencies in providing the conditions for both the home and the agency which are more optimal, must be flexible enough and individual enough to provide a variety of program choices to match the particular needs of families.

What is basically lacking in the research, because of the preponderant child psychological emphasis, are the data about parent attitudes toward agencies as these, in turn, influence children. We do not sufficiently understand the varieties of attitudes which parents hold toward agencies and the ways these influence their desire to participate, or their level of participation, and further, we lack hard data about how these attitudes and behaviors in turn effect child performance.

The infant studies reveal that within the first year of life a variety of family variables are already influencing the development of competence. It

is unclear from the studies reported here or from the literature in general how much substance should be given to the critical period hypothesis. Nevertheless, if parental behavior does influence the infant, and if, as White and his colleagues, Gordon and his associates, have indicated, these variables can be isolated and program mounted to inform parent, then this offers strong support for movement toward more Home Start-like operations within Head Start.

The pilot work of Tuck combined with the psychiatric position of Grier and Cobbs, the views presented by Tastaneda and Billingsley, and the sex differences found across a number of studies, point to the importance of increasing our understanding of involving fathers in Head Start and Head Start-like programs in ways that are relevant within the father's culture and are useful to his children. We need, however, considerably more information which can probably best be gained in field evaluations in association with service programs of just how fathers influence their children and how fathers can be effectively involved. This may require a completely different view of parent involvement than the maternally oriented effort of teaching mothers activities to use at home with their children, or coming to class to work as aides, or the provision of a sewing machine. We lack here clear directions, either theoretically or empirically, but the beginnings are present in this review.

REFERENCES

Adkins, D. C. Programs of Head Start parent involvement in Hawaii. A section of the final report, 1969-70. Honolulu: Education Research and Development Center, Hawaii University, January 1971.

Bell, R. A study of family influences on the education of white lower-class children. 1967-68 (no publication information). Cited by E. Grotberg, Review of Research 1965-1969, prepared by: Project Head Start. (Pamphlet 6108-13) Washington, D.C.: Office of Economic Opportunity, June 1969, Pp. 32-33.

Bell, S. M. The development of the concept of object as related to infant-mother attachment. Child Development, 1970, 41, 291-311.

Bennett, W. B. Operation Head Start, the Queens Borough Public Library program for bookless homes. Jamaica, N.Y.: Queens Borough Public Library, 1966. Division of Library Service and Educational Facilities, Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Billingsley, A. Black Families in White America. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1968.

Bissell, J. Implementation of planned variation in Head Start, first year report, review and summary. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 1971.

Bittner, M. L. An evaluation of the preschool readiness centers program in East St. Louis, Ill. Final report, July 1, 1967-June 30, 1968.

Black Child Development Institute. From a Black Perspective: Optimum Conditions for Minority Involvement in Quality Child Development Programming. Washington, D.C.: BCDI, 1971.

Bloom, B. Stability and Change in Human Characteristics. New York: Wiley and Co., 1964.

Boger, R. P. & Ambron, S. R. Subpopulation Profiling of the Psycho-educational Dimensions of Disadvantaged Preschool Children. In E. Grotberg (Ed.), Critical Issues in Research Related to Disadvantaged Children. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1969. (Research Seminar #3)

Boger, R. P. Parents as p[illegible]ary change agents in experimental Head Star[illegible]ogram of language intervention. Experimental Program Report. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, Head Start Evaluation and Research Center; Detroit, Michigan: Merrill Palmer Institute, November 1969.

Bradshaw, C. E. Relationships between maternal behavior and infant performance in environmentally disadvantaged homes. In I.J. Gordon (Ed.) Relationships between selected family variables and maternal and infant behavior in a disadvantaged population. Gainesville, Florida: University of Florida, Institute for the Development of Human Resources, 1969.

Bronfenbrenner, U. Motivational and Social Components in Compensatory Education Programs-Selected Principles, Practices, and Research Designs. In Needs of Elementary and Secondary Education for the 70's, A Compendium of Policy Papers. Washington, D.C.: Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, March 1970.

Campbell, W. J. Sociocultural environment and educational progress. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of London, 1951.

Childhood Resources, Survey of home-centered educational services to pre-school children. (Final Report to the Office of Child Development, September7, 1971) Washington, D.C.: Childhood Resources, Inc., 1971.

Chilman, C. S. Growing Up Poor. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, May 1966.

Chilman, C. S. Parent Participation: Trends and Related Resources. (Undated Manuscript, circulated 1968)

Clarizio, H. F. Maternal Attitude Change Associated With Involvement in Project Head Start. July 1968.

Cohen, D. K. The Schools and Parental Involvement. Center for Educational Policy Research, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, 1969.

Cohen, S. A. Local control and the cultural deprivation falla[illegible]. Phi Delta Kappan, 1969, 50, 255-258.

Cole, M. & Bruner, J. S. Preliminaries to a theory of cultural difference. Prepublication manuscript, National Society for the Study of Education, 1972.

Conant, M. Early Education Project, Prince George's County Public Schools. Second Progress Report, February 1971.

Costello, J., Hirsch, J.G., Borowitz, G. H. & Martin, J. IJR Pre-School Project Report, Preschool Programs. Vol. I. Institute for Juvenile Research, 1969.

Cox, S. H. Family background effects on personality development and social acceptance. (Report No. BR-5-0417) Ft. Worth, Tex.: Christian University, August 7, 1968.

Datta, L. A Report on Evaluation Studies of Project Head Start. Washington, D.C.: Project Head Start Office of Child Development, 1969.

de la Garza, R. Parent-School-Community Involvement Project. Southwest Educational Development Lab, Austin, Texas, 1971.

Early childhood education learning system for three and four-year-old migrant children, McAllen, Texas. (Evaluation report, 1968-1969) Austin, Tex.: Southwest Educational Development Lab, July 31, 1969.

Etheridge, G. The relationship of marital status of the mother and sex of the infant to maternal variable scores and infant performance. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1971.

Feldman, C. & Shen, M. Some language-related cognitive advantages of bilingual five-year-olds. The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1971, 118, 235-244.

Fitzsimmons, S. J. & Rowe, M. P. Findings From a Study in Child Care. Day Care Programs Reprint Series. Vol. 1. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, National Center for Educational Communication.

Garber, M. Ethnicity and measures of educability. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California) Los Angeles, 1968.

Garber, M. & Tocco, T. The measurement of environmental process characteristics in six Follow Through communities. In I. J. Gordon & R. E. Jester (Ed.) Reaching the Child Through Parent Education: The Florida Approach. Gainesville, Fla.: Institute for the Development of Human Resources, University of Florida, 1969. Pp. 76-86.

Garber, M. & Ware, W. Relationships between measures of the home environment and beginning achievement in school. Theory into Practice, 1972, in press.

Gordon, I. J. A home learning center approach to early stimulation. (Adapted from progress report on project No. 5 RO1 MH1603704 to NIMH) Gainesville, Fla.: Institute for the Development of Human Resources, 1972. (a)

Gordon, I. J. Developing parent power. In E. Grotberg (Ed.) Critical Issues in Research Related to Disadvantaged. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1969. (Research Seminar #5) (d)

Gordon, I. J. Early Childhood Stimulation Through Parent Education. Final report to Children's Bureau, Project number P.H.S. R-306 (01). Gainesville, Florida: Institute for the Development of Human Resources, 1969. (c)

Gordon, I. J. & Jester, R. E. Insturctional strategies in infant stimulation. Final report to NIMH on project number 5 ROl NH 17347-02. Gainesville, Florida: Institute for the Development of Human Resources, 1972.

Gordon, I. J. On Early Learning: The Modifiability of Human Potential. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA, 1971. (b)

Gordon, I. J. Parent Involvement in Compensatory Education. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1970.

Gordon, I. J. Reaching the child through parent education: The Florida Approach. Gainesville, Fla.: Institute for the Development of Human Resources, 1969. (a)

Gordon, I. J. The Florida Parent Education Program for Head Start Planned Variation. Gainesville, Fla.: Institute for the Development of Human Resources, March 1971. (c)

Gray, S. W. The Child's First Teacher. Childhood Education, 1971, 48 (3).

Grier, W. H. & Cobbs, P. M. Black Rage. New York: Basic Books, 1968.

Grotberg, E. H. Review of Research 1965-1969, Prepared by: Project Head Start. (Pamphlet 6108-13) Washington, D.C.: Office of Economic Opportunity, June 1969.

Harm, M. G. How to Encourage and Use Parents on Advisory Bodies, Parts I & II. Head Start Newsletters, January & March 1968.

Head Start Newsletter, September 1968, 3 (4). Washington, D.C.: Project Head Start, Office of Economic Opportunity, September 1968.

Head Start parent involvement orientation kit. Denver, Co. : MIDCO Educational Associates, 1971.

Head Start Policy Manual. Washington, D.C.: Office of Child Development, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, August 10, 1970.

Henderson, R. W. Environmental stimulation and intellectual development of Mexican-American children: An exploratory study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Arizona, 1967.

Herman, S. The relationship between maternal variable scores and infant performance in a Negro experimental stimulation training population. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1970.

Hervey, S. D. Attitudes, expectations, and behavior of parents of Head Start and non-Head Start children. (Report No. 1) Merrill- Palmer Institute, July 15, 1968.

Hess, R. D. Parental Behavior and Children's School Achievement: Implications for Head Start. In E. Grotberg (Ed.), Critical Issues in Research Related to Disadvantaged Children. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1969. (Research Seminar #5) (b)

Hess, R. D. Community involvement in day care. In Day Care: Resources for Decisions. Washington, D.C.: Office of Economic Opportunity, June 1971.

Hess, R. D., Shipman, V. C., Brophy, J. E., Bear, R. M. & Adelberger, A. B. The Cognitive Environments of Urban Preschool Children: Follow-Up Phase. Chicago: The University of Chicago, The Graduate School of Education, 1969. (a)

Hess, R. D., Block, M., Costello, J., Knowles, R. T., & Largay, D. Parent involvement in early education. In Day Care: Resources for Decisions Washington, D.C.: Office of Economic Opportunity, June 1971. Pp. 265-298.

Hess, R. D. (Principal Investigator) Kramer, R., Slaughter, D., Torney, J., Berry, C., Berry, C. & Hull, E. Techniques for Assessing Cognitive and Social Abilities of Children and Parents in Head Start. Report on Research Contract OEO-519 with the Office of Economic Opportunity, University of Chicago, July 1966.

Holmes, D. & Holmes, M. B. An evaluation of differences among different classes of Head Start participants. (Final report, No. OEO-1271, Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C.) New York: Associated Young Men's-Young Women's Hebrew Association of Greater New York, 1966.

Jacobs, S. H. & Pierce-Jones, J. Parent involvement in Project Head Start. (Part of final report on Head Start evaluation and research, 1968-1969, to the Office of Economic Opportunity) Austin, Tex.: Texas University, Child Development Evaluation and Research Center, October 1969.

Jester, R. E. & Bailey, J. R. Hearing-speech scores on the Griffiths Mental Development Scale as a function of language usage in the home. Reaching the Child Through Parent Education, The Florida Approach. Gainesville, Fla.: Institute for the Development of Human Resources, 1969. Pp. 21-31.

The Juniper Gardens parent cooperative nursery. (Final progress report for OEO) Juniper Gardens Children's Project, Kansas City, Missouri, August 31, 1968.

Karnes, J. B. Educational intervention at home by mothers of disadvantaged infants. Child Development, 1970, 40, 925-935.

Keeves, J. P. The home environment and educational achievement. Unpublished manuscript, Australian National University, October 1970.

Keller, S. The social world of the urban slum child: Some early findings. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1963, 33 (5), 823-831.

Kirschner Associates, Inc. A National Survey of the Impacts of Head Start Centers on Community Institutions. (Project No. B89-4638) Washington, D.C.: Office of Child Development, May 1970.

Kowatrakul, S. Need achievement teaching for Head Start children and their mothers. Philadelphia: Temple University College of Education, 1970.

Leler, H. Research on a community initiated self-determining preschool program, 1968. In E. H. Grotberg, Review of Research 1965-1969, prepared by: Project Head Start. (Pamphlet 6108-13) Washington, D.C.: Office of Economic Opportunity, June 1969.

Levenstein, P. Cognitive growth in preschoolers through verbal interaction with mothers. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1970, 40 (3), 130-134.

Levenstein, P. Learning through (and from) mothers. Childhood Education. 1971, 48 (3), 130-134.

McCarthy, J. L. G. Changing Parent Attitudes and Improving Language and Intellectual Abilities of Culturally Disadvantaged Four-Year-Old Children Through Parent Involvement. Indiana University, June 1968.

McDavid, J. W. Innovations in Education of the Disadvantaged Child: What Have We Learned? Paper presented at the meeting of the Social Science Research Council, Portsmouth, N. H., May 1969.

McNamara, J. R., Porterfield, C. L., Miller, L. E. & Arnold, H. S. Evaluation of the Effects of Head Start Experience in the Areas of Self-Concept, Social Skills, and Language Skills. (Pre-publication draft: Not for attribution or quotation without permission of the authors) July 1968.

Mandel, D. M. Influencing attitudes of parents and teachers through rewarding children. (In final report on Head Start Evaluation and Research--1966-67 to the Institute for Educational Development) Austin, Texas: Texas University, Child Development and Evaluation Research Center, June 1968.

Manning, A. Parent Participation Workshop Program. Center for Urban Education, New York City, 1971.

MIDCO Orientation Kit for The Parents' Section Head Start Policy Manual. Denver, Co.: MIDCO Educational Associates, Inc., revised 1971.

Miller, G. W. Educational Opportunity and the Home. London, England: Longman, 1971.

Miller, J. O. Diffusion of intervention effects in disadvantaged families. George Peabody College for Teachers, Demonstration and Research Center for Early Education, a Component of the National Laboratory on Early Childhood Education. Urbana, Ill.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Early Childhood Education, College of Education, University of Illinois, 1968.

Mouat, L. Child-parent education centers. Instructor, 1969, 79, 156-157.

Nedler, S. & Sebera, P. Intervention strategies for Spanish-speaking preschool children. Child Development, 1971, 42, 259-267.

Nimnicht, G. Overview of Responsive Model Program. Berkeley, Cal.: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, July 1970. (Contract No. OEC-0-70-3362) Washington, D.C.: Division of Educational Laboratories, National Center for Educational Research and Development, Office of Education.

Nimnicht, G. The time for a new set of directions for Head Start and other intervention programs is overdue. Unpublished paper, October 1971.

Office of Child Development. Project Head Start 1968: The Development of a Program. Washington, D.C.: Office of Child Development, January 1971.

Office of Child Development. Toward an Evaluation Strategy for FAP-Day Care Evaluation. Washington, D.C.: Office of Child Development, January 1971.

Ortar, G. An experiment to improve disadvantaged mothers' speech directed at their small children. Research report to the Ford Foundation from Hebrew University, Jerusalem, March 1971.

Pickett, L. Report of a Survey Project on Head Start Parents in Classrooms. Denver, Co.: MIDCO, 1971.

Radin, N. & Lonquist, H. The Gale Pre-school Program Final Report. Ypsilanti, Mich.: Ypsilanti Public Schools, March 12, 1968.

Radin, N. The impact of a kindergarten home counseling program. Exceptional Children, 1969, 36, 251-256.

Ramsay, A. M. Action Stimulator No. 34: Parents as Teachers. Afram Associates, Inc., September 1970.

Resnick, M. The relationship between language ability and intellectual and behavioral functioning in environmentally disadvantaged two- and three-year olds. Doctoral dissertation in progress, University of Florida.

Roberts, B. A manual on programs for parents of pre-school children participating in the Queens Borough Public Library's operation Head Start book program for 3-5 year olds. Jamaica, N.Y.: Queens Borough Public Library, Division of Library Services and Educational Facilities, Office of Education, 1966.

Ruopp, R. A small U.N., central city Head Start day care center, Salt Lake City, Utah. In A Study in Child Care. Vol. IIA. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Educational Communication, Office of Education, 1971. (a)

Ruopp, R. Like being at home, Greeley Parent Child Center, Greeley, Colorado. In A Study in Child Care. Vol. IIA. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Educational Communication, Office of Education, 1971. (b)

Rupp, J. C. Opvoeding Tot School-Weerbaarherd (Helping the Child to Cope with School) Groninger, Netherlands: Wolters-Noordhoff, 1969.

Schaefer, E. Home Tutoring, Maternal Behavior, and Infant Intellectual Development. Symposium paper presented at the American Psychological Association Annual Convention, Washington, D.C., September 1969.

Scheinfeld, D. R. On developing developmental families. In E. Grotberg (Ed.) Critical Issues in Research Related to Disadvantaged Children. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1969.

Shapiro, E. Involving community and parents. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, 1967.

Slaughter, D. T. Maternal antecedents of the academic achievement behavior of Afro-American Head Start children. Educational Horizons, Fall 1969.

Slaughter, D. T. Parental potency and the achievements of inner city Black children. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1970, 40 (3), 433-440.

Smilansky, S. The effects of sociodramatic play on disadvantaged pre-school children. New York: Wiley, 1968.

Smykal, A. A comparative investigation of home environmental variables related to achieving and under-achieving behavior of academically able high school students. Dissertation Abstracts, 1962, 23, No. 1, P. 315.

Steen, C., Kitano, H. Developing the Role of Parent as Teacher with Head Start Populations. (Research report) Westwood, Cal.: UCLA, 1968.

Stern, C. Increasing the effectiveness of parents-as-teachers. Los Angeles: California University, December 1970.

Swift, M. Language style of the lower-class mother: A preliminary study of a therapeutic technique. Philadelphia: Hahnemann Community Mental Health Center, 1968.

Tastaneda, A. Mexican-American and Educational Change Symposium. Riverside, Cal.: University of California, May 21 & 22, 1971.

Tuck, S. Working with Black fathers. (Institute for Juvenile Research, Chicago, Ill.) American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1971, 41 (3), 465-472.

Wachs, T. D., Uzgiris, I. C. & Hunt, J. MCV. Cognitive development in infants of different age levels and from different environmental backgrounds: An exploratory investigation. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1971, 17, 283-317.

Watts, J. C. & Barnett, J. C. Environment. Mimeo manuscript of chapter 8, 1971.

Weikart, D. P. Learning through parents: Lessons for teachers. Childhood Education, 1971, 48 (3), 135-137.

West, E. H. Home-school relationships. The Journal of Negro Education, 1967, 36, 349-352.

White, B. L. Fundamental Early Environmental Influences on the Development of Competency. In M. Meyer (Ed.) Third Symposium on Learning: Cognitive Learning. Bellingham, Wash.: Western Washington State College, 1972.

Wille, L. Moms are a must. American Education, 1970, 6 (3), 25-29.

Williams, F. (Ed.) Language and Poverty: Perspectives on a Theme. Chicago: Markham Publishing Co., 1970.

Wolf, R. M. The identification and measurement of environmental process variables related to intelligence. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1964.

Yarrow, L., Rubenstein, J., & Pederson, F. Dimensions of early stimulation: Differential effects on infant development. Papers presented at the meeting of the Society for Research on Child Development, Minneapolis, April 1971.